The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.12

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

Ecclesiastical Review.

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1881.

VOL. XII.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET E.C.

LONDON : WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO., PRINTERS, CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL.

283.05
CHU
1.12

CONTENTS OF VOL. XII.

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

Diversity in Unity the Law of Spiritual Life—By Rev. Edwin Hatch, M.A. 1
Dedication Festivals—By Rev. Francis Exton, M.A. 5
Ordination Sermon—By Rev. Francis King, D.D. . 13
Lessons of Dedication Festivals—By Rev. F. F. Kelly, LL.M. 18
Prayer and its Object—By Rev. W. H. Barlow, B.D. 25
Honour to the King—By Rev. F. R. Wynne, M.A. 28
Revised Version—By Rev. F. Tilney Bassett, M.A. 37
Fraud and its Consequences—By Rev. G. C. Smythe 41
Sermon on Lord Hatherley—By Canon Farrar ... 49
Days of Trouble—By Rev. William Alnwick ... 52
Sermon on Dean Stanley—By Dean Vaughan ... 61
Spiritual Worship—By Rev. H. C. Mitchinson, M.A. 65
Redeeming the Time—By Rev. C. Wordsworth ... 73
The Preaching of the Word—By Rev. G. E. Watkins 75
The Work of the Physician—By Canon Liddon ... 85
Clericalism—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A. ... 90
Spiritual Churchbuilding—By Canon Rawstorne ... 97
The Divine Orbit of Life—By Rev. E. Thring, M.A. 101
The Man of Sin—By Rev. R. C. W. Raban, M.A. 109
The Threshing Floor of Ornan : the Future Temple —By Rev. T. Archibald S. White, M.A. ... 111
The Lord's Song in Unbelief—By Canon Liddon ... 121
Elijah on Carmel and the Wet Harvest Time—By Rev. F. Tilney Bassett, M.A. 125
The Visitation of God—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 133
What Bars "The Way"—By Rev. E. Thring, M.A. 137
He Descended into Hell—By Ven. Archdeacon Reichel, D.D. 145
Man's Work and God's Work in Salvation—By Rev. Basil M. Jones, M.A. 149
Sermon on Dean Stanley—By Canon Farrar ... 157
Deliverance from Bondage and Death—By Rev. Thomas Bates, M.A. 161
Congress Sermon—By the Bishop of Manchester ... 169
Spirit and Life—By Rev. T. G. Bonney, M.A., F.R.S. 173
Pessimism : Atheism—By Ven. Archdeacon Reichel 181
Things New and Old—By Rev. Prebendary Currey 184
Divided Allegiance—By Rev. G. C. Hawkins, M.A. 193
The Last Message of the President—By Rev. W. B. Philpot, M.A. 196
Jeremiah's Warnings—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne... 205
The Christian Solution of Social Problems—By Very Rev. J. C. Macdonnell, D.D. 217
Over-Anxiety—By Rev. J. A. Carr, LL.D. ... 220
The Gift of the Holy Ghost to the Whole Church as the Body of Christ—By Rev. Canon Medd ... 233
Harvest Thanksgiving—By Rev. F. Tilney Bassett 238
Morality and Dogma—By Bishop of Peterborough .. 249
The Continuity of the Law and the Gospel—By Rev. J. M. Wilson, M.A. 265
All Saints' Day—By Rev. W. B. Philpot, M.A. ... 269
Harvest Sermon—By Rev. Edward Meade, M.A.... 281
The Work of the Holy Spirit—By Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M.A. 284
Church Bells—By Ven. Maurice T. de Burgh, M.A. 297
Secularism—By Rev. Joseph Foxley, M.A. ... 299
The Kingdom of God, not in Word but in Power—By Very Rev. R. W. Church, D.D. 313
Death—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. 317
God's Presence—By the Bishop of Durham ... 325

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

"The Way to Heaven"—By Rev. E. Thring, M.A. 328
Immoral Acquiescence—By Canon Farrar, F.R.S... 337
Sufferings and Patience of Jesus—By Rev. H. H. Davies, Ph. D. 339
God's Grace—By Rev. H. L. Thompson, M.A. ... 343

SERMONS BY :—

Bishop of Durham—God's Presence 325
Bishop of Manchester—Church Congress Sermon ... 169
Bishop of Peterborough—Morality and Dogma ... 249
Dean of Llandaff—Funeral Sermon on Dean Stanley 61
Dean of St. Paul's—The Kingdom of God, not in Word but in Power 313
Alnwick, Rev. William—Days of Trouble 52
Barlow, Rev. W. H.—Prayer and its Object ... 25
Bassett, Rev. F. Tilney—The Revised Version ... 37
Bassett, Rev. F. Tilney—Elijah on Carmel and the Wet Harvest Time 125
Bassett, Rev. F. Tilney—Harvest Thanksgiving ... 238
Bates, Rev. Thomas—Deliverance from Bondage and Death 161
Bonney, Rev. T. G.—The Spirit and the Life ... 173
Burgh, Ven. Maurice T. de—Church Bells 297
Bladon, Rev. George—Death 317
Currey, Rev. Prebendary—Things New and Old ... 184
Carr, Rev. J. A.—Over Anxiety 220
Davies, Rev. H. H., Ph. D.—Sufferings and Patience of Jesus 339
Exton, Rev. Francis—Dedication Festivals... ... 5
Farrar, Rev. Canon—Funeral Sermon on Dean Stanley 157
Farrar, Rev. Canon, F.R.S.—Immoral Acquiescence 337
Foxley, Rev. Joseph—Secularism 299
Hatch, Rev. Edwin—Diversity in Unity the Law of Spiritual Life 1
Hawkins, Rev. E. C.—Divided Allegiance... ... 193
Jones, Rev. Basil M.—Man's Work and God's Work in Salvation 149
Kelly, Rev. F. F.—Lessons of Dedication Festivals 18
King, Rev. Francis—Ordination Sermon 13
Liddon, Rev. Canon—The Work of the Physician .. 85
Liddon, Rev. Canon—The Lord's Song in Unbelief 121
Liddon, Rev. Canon—The Visitation of God ... 133
Macdonnell, Very Rev. J. C.—The Christian Solution of Social Problems 217
Medd, Rev. Canon—The Gift of the Holy Ghost to the Whole Church as the Body of Christ ... 233
Mitchinson, Rev. H. C.—Spiritual Worship ... 65
Meade, Rev. Edward—Harvest Sermon 281
Moule, Rev. H. C. G.—Work of the Holy Spirit ... 284
Philpot, Rev. W. B.—Last Message of the President 196
Philpot, Rev. W. B.—All Saints' Day 269
Raban, Rev. R. C.—The Man of Sin 109
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon—Clericalism 90
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon—Jeremiah's Warnings ... 205
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon—Spiritual Churchbuilding. 97
Reichel, Ven. Archdeacon—He Descended into Hell 145
Reichel, Ven. Archdeacon—Pessimism : Atheism... 181
Smythe, Rev. G. C.—Fraud and its Consequences.. 41
Thompson, Rev. H. L., M.A.—God's Grace ... 343
Thring, Rev. Edward—The Divine Orbit of Life ... 101

988246

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Thring, Rev. Edward—What Bars "The Way" ... 137
Rev. E. Thring, M.A.—"The Way" to Heaven ... 328
Wynne, Rev. F. R.—Honour to the King 28
Wordsworth, Rev. C.—Redeeming the Time ... 73
Watkins, Rev. G. E.—The Preaching of the Word. 75
White, Rev. T. Archibald—The Threshing Floor of Ornan: The Future Temple 111
Wilson, Rev. J. M.—The Continuity of the Law and the Gospel 265

LEADING ARTICLES :—

Contagious Diseases Acts, 7, 30, 45, 55, 67, 93, 152, 164, 188, 222, 309
Clerical Study 19
The Irish Land Bill 80
Clerical and Medical Professions 102
Biology and Divinity 114
Diocesan Conferences 138
Polygamy 198, 209, 261
The Old Catholic Movement 241
Love of Truth 319

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"Thrift Lessons"—By Rev. John Walters ... 22
The Creed of Science—By William Graham ... 22
Individualism—By Bishop Littlejohn 32
Letter to Rev. C. Voysey, from a Christian Theist 33
Religion Freed from State Control—By Venerable Archdeacon Hessey 34
Was Abraham a Christian?—By Mrs. Chudleigh ... 47
The Organization of the Early Christian Churches—By Edwin Hatch 57
A New Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew—By G. B. Nicholson 58
The Sling and the Stone—By Voysey 59
Our New New Testament—By E. B. Nicholson ... 71
The Clergyman's Magazine 71
The Churchman 82
Practical Reflections on every verse of the Holy Gospels 96
Lectures in Defence of the Christian Faith—By Godet 105
The Church's Work and Wants—By B. Harrison ... 131
The History of the Rise and Progress of the Church and Parish of St. George the Martyr, Holborn 168
A New Analogy between Revealed Religion and the Course and Constitution of Nature 191
Old Testament History of Redemption 215
The Souls of the Righteous—By Savage 227
The Great Dilemma—By Ottley 257
Hagar 258
A Charge by the Bishop of Llandaff 289
Non-Miraculous Christianity—By G. Salmon ... 307
Sins of the Flesh—By J. M. Wilson 308
Purity—By B. G. Bulkeley 308
Ecclesiastes—By Plumptre 323
The Modern Atheist—By C. B. Brigstocke 333
St. Giles' Lectures (I. and II.)—By Caird 333
Three Sermons—By F. V. Thornton 333
The Believing Sufferer—By W. Tait 333
The Pulpit Commentary. 1 Kings 347

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Use of the Revised Version 12, 22, 57, 69, 81
Reasons for not Encouraging Doubts about Christianity 22
Contagious Diseases Acts, 32, 46, 56, 68, 80, 94, 103, 116, 129, 141, 153, 164, 180, 189, 201, 213, 229, 245, 261, 277, 293, 309
The Name "Christian" 45, 56
Doctors as Prophets 104
Sermon Writing 104, 129, 141
Revised Version.—The Denarius 129
Church Building 152, 180
Evolution and the Fourth Commandment, 227, 244, 257, 276, 290, 305, 320, 334
Localisation of Education 291

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

District of Street 292
Hagar—By M.D. 292
Early Communion 335
The Intermediate State 348
Love of Truth 348

PAPERS :—

Holy Communion: What Hours and How Frequently . 8
Objects of Bishop Berkeley's Life 11
What Bishop Berkeley did for Cloyne—By Rev. H. Kingsmill Moore 20
Annual Festival of Church Sunday School Institute 21
Critique on a Passage of Shakespeare—By Rev. Francis Exton 46
Art of Speaking and Reading—By Rev. J. B. Sandlands 69, 190, 321
Ruri-Decanal Conferences—By Rev. Augustus Legge 83
Preaching in the Irish Church 102
Address to Sunday School Teachers—By Rev. G. E. Watkins 106, 114
The Old Catholic Liturgy—By Pfarrer Bauer ... 139
The Rev. John Russell at Black Torrington ... 154
The President's Address to the Newcastle Church Congress 176
The Necessity of a Future State—By the late President Garfield 188
The Claims of the Revised Version to general acceptance—By Ven. Edwin Palmer, D.D. ... 199
" ,,—By Rev. Professor Plumptre ... 209
" ,,—By Rev. W. Sanday 223
" ,,—By Dean of Chester ... 226, 243
" ,,—By Chancellor Espin 225
" ,,—By Rev. Professor T. S. Evans ... 242
" ,,—By Rev. J. F. Bateman 243
" ,,—By Rev. A. J. Ross 243
" ,,—By Rev. E. Miller 243
" ,,—By Lord Bishop of Durham ... 244
The Music of Speech—By C. J. Plumptre 228
Divisions within the Church—By Rev. Canon Meade 254
Harvest Home 255
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister 279
Disestablishment and Comprehension in the Church of England—By Rev. F. Brisbane Butler, M.A. 272
Able and Willing: An Address to Children—By Rev. F. Peel 288
Influence of Martin Luther—By Rev. A. S. White .. 304
Lichfield Cathedral: Memorial of Mrs. Bickersteth 321
The Intermediate State—By C. Moore 330
Voluntary Agencies in the Church—By G. E. Watkins 346

MISCELLANEOUS :— PAGE

Central Council of Diocesan Conferences ... 35, 324
Testimonial to Dr. May 48
Bishop of Durham on Revised Version 60
Prize Day at Uppingham School 72
Religious Freedom 96
Presentation to Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol ... 108
Bishop of Bangor on Lay Patronage 120
Restoration of Terrington Church 131
Carlisle Diocesan Conference 143
Sabbath Observance 143
Dean Stanley's Successor 144
The Clergy Seaside Rest 156
Annual Contributions to Missionary Societies ... 303
Tithes distraint for 336
Bishop of Nottingham's Ordination 336
St. George's Home of Mercy 336
Church Association and Canon Girdlestone 336

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS ... 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 232, 264, 280, 292, 312, 324, 335

CLERICAL OBITUARY ... 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 232, 264, 280, 292, 312, 324, 336

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XII.—No. 288. SATURDAY, JULY 2ND, 1881. PRICE TWOPENCE.

The Church of England Pulpit.

DIVERSITY IN UNITY THE LAW OF SPIRITUAL LIFE.

BY THE REV. EDWIN HATCH, M.A., VICE-PRINCIPAL OF ST. MARY HALL; GRINFIELD LECTURER ON THE SEPTUAGINT; BAMPTON LECTURER, 1880.

A SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD ON THE MORNING OF WHIT-SUNDAY, JUNE 5, 1881.

"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all."—1 COR. xii. 4—6.

THE analogy between the material and the spiritual world is a common-place of preachers. It is one which in this early summer-time almost forces itself on our attention; for though the sense of the marvel of it is blunted by the constancy of its succession, we are once more face to face with the mystery of a new creation. Year after year, through untold centuries of years, has the summer died into the winter and been born again into spring: year after year when we are lying, as our fathers lie, among the unremembered dead, will the green grass of the cornfields, and the bright blossoming of the flowers, be the acted parable of the resurrection.

And year after year, as we look upon this new-born world, we are confronted with the wonder, not only of its existence, but of its variety. There are infinite differences of individuals; no two plants are absolutely the same; every tree is unique; "the meanest flower that blows" has its own personality of beauty. There are infinite varieties of kind; every continent, every country, and even every locality, has its own special kinds. The limit to their number seems to be only the limit of our opportunities of observation. New kinds are constantly being found, and new kinds are also constantly coming into existence. For there is not only variety, but the power of variation. The type of each kind varies its expression from age to age. It is not now what it was in earlier periods of the history of our globe. It is constantly re-adapting itself to changed conditions. Life, and variety, and the power of variation, go everywhere hand in hand. There is fixity and absolute uniformity only in death.

All this is the parable of human society. In the vast fields of human life natures are as various as the summer flowers. Every one of us has his own character (χαρακτήρ), his own special stamp of God. Every one of us has his own temperament (*temperamentum*), his own special mingling of the elements of which our nature is compounded. There clings to every one of us the inalienable sense of personality. We are ourselves, and no other; and we are so because there is none like us in the whole vast range of the universe which God has made. Nor is the difference one of individuality only; there are, even in the same community, types of character so distinct from one another that the aims, the motives, the pursuits, of one class of men are almost unintelligible to the other. Their whole mental attitude is different. They live in different worlds. The same fact has for the several classes an entirely different significance. They look upon the same landscape from an entirely different point of view, so that that which is prominent in the foreground of the one is lost in the dim distance of the other. And if we look outside any one community, there are found between different communities differences

not only of mental attitude, but almost of mental structure. There are languages, for example, whose syntax is so different from our own that it is almost impossible to find for an idea which has been expressed in the one an equivalent form in the other. There are religions so different from our own that we cannot bring ourselves to see how for one hour they could be conceived as either pleasing their own grim gods or satisfying the first needs of men. And if we take a still wider view, and look not merely at contemporary life, but at the successive strata of life which make up history, we find that, just as in the physical world the types of animals or plants have assumed in successive ages widely differing forms, so in human society the same types have not been constantly reproduced. The prevailing temper of one age has not been the prevailing temper of the next. Ideas which in one age have seemed to be fundamental have seemed to another age to be illusory. Institutions which in one age have seemed to be necessary parts of the framework of society, have been discarded in another age as cumbrous scaffolding. It is hardly possible to point to a single idea, or to a single institution, which has been constant in all ages and in all societies. If we take, for example, the idea of personal liberty, to us it is almost axiomatic. We do not discuss its desirability, but assume it. We lay it down as a principle of all legislation and all intercourse. We allow it to be interfered with only in cases of strong necessity, for the safety of society as a whole. But there have been times at which it was equally axiomatic that there should be slaves. Or if we take the institution of private property. It is the largest stone in the present basis of society. It is fenced round with every barrier which society can devise. It is regarded as an indefeasible right. And yet the researches of scientific jurists enable us not only to go back to a time when it did not exist, but also to see in some existing communities institutions which exclude it.

And this movement of ideas and institutions is continually going on. We never "abide in one stay." The history of our race not only has been, but is at this moment, the history of a constant re-adaptation to changed and changing circumstances. Whether we look at morals or at politics, at ideas or at institutions, we come back to the analogy with which we began. In human society, as in the material world, variety and the power of variation are the law and symbol of life, the mode of its manifestation, and the proof of its existence.

Now if we turn from human society as a whole to that part of it which, at various times and in various places, has accepted the Christian faith, we may antecedently expect that what is essential and necessary in the one, will be also, with whatever modifications of detail, essential and necessary in the other.

If the Church were a merely artificial institution, superinduced upon human society by an external force, such a proposition, doubtless, would not hold; but if it be, as we believe it to be, human society itself—ultimately the whole, at present a part of it—redeemed, purified, and brought nearer to God, then there is no ground for supposing any change in the divine economy in relation to it except such as arises from the fact that what was once unclean now is holy, and what was once alienated is now reconciled to God. "The multitude of them that believed," in becoming Christians did not cease to be men. The same God who made men redeemed them; the same Spirit who once "dove-like sat brooding o'er the vast abyss" informs and quickens the regenerate soul. The creation and the re-creation are part of the same divine action; they are the work of the same co-operating Trinity; they result in analogous forms of life.

This is what we might antecedently expect, and this is what we find to have been in fact the case.

If we look back upon the history of the Church we find that its main features are, in fact, the main features of the general history of mankind. The thoughts, the tendencies, the institutions of one age, have not always been the thoughts, the institutions, the tendencies, of the next. The basis is, no doubt, in all cases the same. "The Church's one Foundation is Jesus Christ our Lord." His life and words, as they are presented in the Gospels, form a limit which Christian men cannot overpass or alter without ceasing to be Christian. So far as Christian doctrine consists in repeating those sacred words, and so far as Christian institutions have the direct appointment of the Master, variety of doctrine or variety of form is impossible. But that life and those words have suggested at various times various inferences; they have presented themselves under various aspects, according to the varying temper of an epoch or a race; just as travellers who approach a mountain on one side, and in the brightness of a morning sun, have an entirely different view from those who approach it on another side, and under a dull or stormy sky.

There have been times, for example, at which the dominant temper of the Christian world has been metaphysical. The subtle distinctions between substance, matter, and essence, which no modern student of Greek philosophy has yet succeeded in precisely formulating, were at one time the common property of educated men in the Roman world.

There have been times again in which the prevailing temper has been mystical, in which the seen and the unseen, the present and the future, seemed to be linked together by such subtle bonds that whatever could be discovered about the one was an infallible clue to the other.

When either of these tempers has prevailed, the aspect under which the life and words of Christ have presented themselves to men's minds, and

the inferences which they have drawn from them, have been so different from those which we should draw in our own times, that, though we may accept them as true, we are at the same time compelled to look at many of them as being only dimly intelligible.

For we in our day are passing through a different phase. Our tendency is to seek not for substance, but for sequences, and to look not at the possible, but at the actual. When we try to interpret nature or history, our tendency is to thread facts upon ideal strings, finding a theory for all that we can read of, and a law for all that we can see. When we try to interpret Scripture our aim is to find out, not what it may mean if interpreted mystically, but what it does mean if interpreted grammatically. This, too, may be only a passing phase, but for the time it is the dominant phase; and we move so completely within it that former phases have ceased not only to have an interest for us, but also to be understood. What *οὐσία* meant in the later Greek philosophy, what it meant in the metaphysics of one school as compared with another, what "real" means in the phrase "real presence," what "substance" means in the term "transubstantiation," are questions which belong to so different a horizon from our own that few living persons are competent to express an opinion upon them. The answers to them lie, for us at least, on the other side of the great sphere of truth, of which no mortal eye can see more than one side at a time.

And as it has been with the aspects under which the life and words of our Lord have at various times presented themselves to men's minds, and with the inferences which have been at various times drawn from them, so it has been with the forms in which, at various times, men have tried to realize the Christian society. Those forms of organization do not in any case rest upon an explicit divine command. If our Lord had explicitly said that every church should have its bishop and its presbyters, and that all churches should be linked together in a visible and world-wide confederation, it would have been for us Christian men not to argue, but to obey. But there is no such command. Whatever is gathered from the New Testament in regard to Christian organization is gathered by way of inference, and in most cases of remote inference. And, as a matter of history, the organizations have varied widely, not only in any given age, but in one age as compared with another. The reflection of the Roman empire, which is visible in the post-Nicean effort at confederation, and that of the Roman municipal system, which is visible in the western provinces after the Roman empire fell, are different, not only in detail, but in conception, from that kind of organization which the Carlovingian emperors fostered, or that which became a necessity in the Reformed churches of Germany.

In other words, Church history tends to establish the presumption which is raised by antecedent considerations, that in the Church, as in the world, in society in its new relation to God, as in society in its old relation to God, variety is the law of life, and that ideas and institutions not only differ, but are meant to be different. It does not follow that the Holy Spirit is not leading the Church into all truth because, in the vast area of human society, He shows this and that group of men only one side at a time: it does not follow that He is not shaping the forms of ecclesiastical organization, because those forms are as varied as the types of trees and flowers. On the contrary, all this variety tends to show that the Lord and Giver of the life natural is the Lord and Giver also of the life spiritual; that the infinite variety of the one is the type and symbol of the infinite variety of the other; that beneath the one, as beneath the other, varying His operation to the varying needs of men, shaping His utterances to their varied comprehensions, is the one Father and the one Spirit from Whom we come and to Whom we go.

The difficulty which some persons find in realising this variety of the operation of the Holy Spirit seems to arise from the vastness of its scale. Within certain limits we are all ready to admit it. We frame or accept an institution or a formula, and are ready, within the limits of that institution or that formula, to allow certain variations of detail. But we limit the variations to that which we ourselves would have been able or willing to do under similar circumstances. We work in grooves; we cast thoughts and institutions into moulds; the possibility of giving to the same fact a multitude of expressions, and of developing the same law in an infinity of forms, passes beyond alike our comprehension and our powers. But though we cannot comprehend the ways of God, we may for all that recognise that they are not as our ways, and that the limits of our comprehension are not the limits of His action. But this is precisely what a large proportion of Christian men decline to do in regard to the history of the Church. They are almost clamorous in asserting that its builder and maker is God; and yet they commit the paradox of trying to limit the divine operation to that which would have been probable, if men had been not only the agents, but the authors of the plan. If Christianity had been an artificially-devised religion, there would have been, in all probability, a single life of the Founder, and a single systematic exposition of His teaching; instead of that, there are four different lives, written apparently for different classes of minds and from different points of view. If the Church had been an artificially-devised institution, there would probably have been a single definite code of rules, and a single prescribed form of government; instead of that, there are no authoritative rules, and there is an almost absolute elasticity of form. In the one case the diversity of record, in the other the variability of

form, and in both cases the contradiction of human analogies, are indications of a deeper than human unity.

This paradoxical tendency to insist upon the divine origin of the Christian Church, and, in the same breath, to throw that Church into an inelastic human mould, is in reality the result of a confusion between two wholly different things—the eternal and divine law of variety, and the temporary and human need of uniformity.

For purposes of association there must be, at any one time, and for any one group of men, rules and formularies. To that particular group, and for the mental horizon of that particular time, those rules and that mode of formulating Christian doctrine may be the best that can be devised. But the fact that in a particular country, or to a particular group of men, that rule and that formula are not only appropriate, but necessary, and being appropriate and necessary, are part of the divine plan, is not inconsistent with the belief that under other circumstances, or for other groups of men, other modes of statement and other rules of order are not less appropriate and not less necessary. In other words, it is competent for a Christian man to say,

"To me, individually, there are some modes of conceiving Christian doctrine which, so far from seeming to be true, are so remote from my own conception that I cannot even place myself in that attitude of mind in which they become intelligible.

"But, on the other hand, I cannot assume either my own infallibility, or my own universality of knowledge. I am conscious that the judgments which I form, and which to me seem incontrovertible, are the result of the complex conditions of my birth, my associations, and my training. I find that there are other men who accept, as I accept, the facts upon which Christianity is founded, whose sincerity, whose mental powers, whose love of God, are at least equal to my own, and yet who express their beliefs in forms which to me seem erroneous, and who frame their church order in a manner which seems to me to be injurious to the Christian life.

"I have no right to deny to them what I claim for myself. I have no right to attempt to limit the operation of the Holy Spirit to that particular mode which has been best for me and for men with my own mental constitution. 'For the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'"

Such a recognition of diversity in unity, of the infinite varieties of mode under which the action of the Holy Spirit has manifested itself in the past, and is manifesting itself in the present, is the modern form of the ancient conception of Catholicity. The ancient form of that conception was unity of organization. There loomed before the eyes of men the vision of a visible order, a single type of government, a single form of worship, a single earthly head. It seemed at one time to be almost realised; but the inelastic framework broke beneath the pressure of the life which it sought to confine. The visible unity broke up, as the Roman Empire broke up; and the attempt to restore the one is as impossible an anachronism as would be the attempt to restore the other; for the "congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world," the congregation of all races, tongues, and climes, of all types of character and of all varieties of mental power, is held together by a deeper than human unity. That unity is neither the unity of compromise, nor the unity of indifference. It is not the unity of an artificial form, but the unity of a divine life. It is the unity of that Spirit whose symbol, now as ever, is seven lamps of fire. In the Church of our own time, as in the Church of apostolic days, in the Church of all time, as in the Church of our own time, "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operation, but it is the same God which worketh all in all."

This truth has many applications and many corollaries. I shall speak to-day only of one, and that one which St. Paul has drawn for us.

When he regards the Church as a whole, he sees in it, as it were, a garden of God with many kinds of flowers—diversities of gifts and differences of operations. When he looks at the individual members of the Church the truth assumes the converse form, "Every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." It is this personal aspect of the truth of the text which has to be insisted upon again and again; and insisted upon not less now than ever before, because now as much as ever before there is a tendency to merge the individual in the mass, and to conceive of the Church as an abstraction, a vague and impalpable thing, apart from the individuals who compose it. But this converse statement of the great fact of the diversity of God's operations recalls us to the fact of our personality. One by one are we born into the world, one by one we die; and in all the solemn passage from birth to death, it is one by one that God holds communion with men and men with God. And one by one we have our work to do—that special and inalienable work which, in the economy of God, none but ourselves can do. No doubt association with our fellows in the Church helps us to do it; for it gives us special means of divine comfort; it surrounds us with the sense of brotherhood; and in all this sadness of baffled effort, this monotony of daily care, this mystery of the Spirit striving with the flesh, it gives us the help and hope which come of sympathy. But association is a means, and not an end; and for all that it can give, our work is still our own. And if our

work be our own, and if the work of each one of us be different, then, side by side with the doing of our own work, must be the recognition of our brother's work. The task is hard, and it is one which few of us accomplish; for, seeing as we do with our purblind eyes some little portion of the vast whole of truth, we are not satisfied until other men see exactly what we see; and finding some special benefit for ourselves in some particular rules of association, we try to impose them upon the rest of all mankind. But in that sublime Catholicity, which is the correlative of the infinite diversity of the manifestation of divine life in human souls, there is no place for antagonism; and for you especially, whose powers are fresh, and who will soon have left your tutelage here to confront your life's work face to face; for you who are feeling in your souls the first stirring of spiritual energy; for you who are fired with the first and holiest enthusiasm to do something before you die, for Christ and for the world—the echo of a divine message seems to sound forth clear and strong, telling you one by one, "Do thine own work, the work of learning, the work of self-reformation, or the work of helping to govern this Church and realm; fulfil thine own ministry, the ministry of teaching, the ministry of healing, or the ministry of peace-making; use thine own gift, thy gift of enthusiasm, thy gift of sympathy, or thy gift of the sense of beauty. What place that work and ministry of thine will have in the mighty whole, it is not for thee to know; it is not for thy dim eyes to see the vast proportions of the temple of living stones which the Master-builder has planned; it is not for thy dull ears to hear the innumerable chords of that vast harmony which is for ever rising from the manifold creation. Let thy care be only lest the manifestation of the Spirit which is given to thee be profitless, lest the place which thou wast destined to fill be a blank, and lest the eternal harmony be—for all that *thou* hast done—a silence or a discord.

DEDICATION FESTIVALS.

By the Rev. FRANCIS EXTON, M.A., Vicar of Alkborough, Brigg.

Sermon Preached in Alkborough Church on June 19th, 1881, being the Sunday before the Feast of its Dedication.

"And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication, and it was winter."—St. John x. 22.

THESE words may well have a few minutes' consideration from us at this time. Next Friday is St. John Baptist's Day, the feast of the dedication of this church: and it surely ought to be both interesting and profitable to us to know that in keeping this feast we are treading in our Blessed Lord's footsteps. Our fathers, no doubt, had our Blessed Lord's example in mind, when they instituted and observed this feast of dedication. But even considered in itself, quite apart from that example, surely the dedication of a church is an event in a parish that deserves to be commemorated year by year. When a church is built, it is, as you know, dedicated to the glory of God, and to the memory of some saint. It is consecrated by the Bishop, solemnly made over to God; so that from that time it is no longer man's property, but God's. And though heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain God, yet He is pleased, in the infinite condescension of His mercy, to make that house His dwelling-place; so that we can say, "*This* is none other but the house of God." It becomes the place of God's special Presence; and all the blessings of that special Presence are brought near to us. It is the House of Prayer in which God loves to be entreated. It is the place in which God loves to gather together all His children, and knit them together by His Grace in love to Him, and in love to one another. Here parents can bring their little ones that inherit from them the taint of sin to the Lord Jesus, to be born anew of water and the Spirit, and be made God's children by adoption and grace. Here the weary and heavy-laden may find rest; the weak, strength; and the penitent, mercy. Here the Body broken, and the Blood shed for guilty man are offered to all without money and without price. Yea, here under the shadow of the church's walls we may commit our loved ones to the earth, not with the bitter, bitter sorrow of those who have no hope, but in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life.

O who can say what a blessing to a parish the mere church-building is,—how it tells for good; what holy influences it exercises even on those who seem to pay least regard to it! Surely there are sermons in its very stones. It is ever teaching, silent teacher though it is; it lifts up our thoughts to another and a better world, and bids us seek those things which are above. But it is when we call to mind the spiritual blessings of which the church is the store-house; the spiritual blessings which God dispenses here,—the Word of Life, the Water of Life, the Bread of Life, the gifts of Grace which He bestows without stint in answer to His children's united prayers; then it is that we see the full value of a church to immortal beings such as we are. Amid the many things there are to lower us to the level of the beasts that perish, to lead us to live as if *our* end were to be like theirs, as if we had no better or more lasting portion, surely *anything* that speaks to the better part within us, and puts us in mind of our proper destiny, is a thing to be thankful for. But when we bethink us how much there is within ourselves ready to yield to the temptations from without,—how little persuading we need to drift on to the grave and to judgment to come, merely eating and

drinking, and catching at this world's fleeting pleasures,—can we be too thankful that we have one place in our midst which God has been pleased to accept and acknowledge as His own; one place where we may have our weak wills strengthened by communion with Him, and be endued with power from on high.

It was with hearts mindful of these blessings, that our forefathers used to assemble in this house year by year on St. John Baptist's day, to thank God for thus abiding among them in all the riches of His mercy, and to dedicate themselves afresh to His service. And can we doubt that those days were days of blessing to this parish, that many a weak soul was strengthened, many a weary one refreshed, many a wanderer brought home again? And if in times of lukewarmness and worldliness the observance of the dedication feast was given up, or lost altogether its religious character, is it not our true wisdom to return into the good old paths, and to endeavour to keep this feast in the way Christians ought to keep it? We see from the text that we have our Blessed Lord's example for keeping a dedication feast. And that which makes His example the more striking is the fact that the feast of dedication He kept was a feast of human appointment. The fact that it was *winter* shews that it was not the dedication of the first temple by Solomon that was commemorated, for that was in the *autumn;* nor yet the dedication of the second temple by Zerubbabel, for that was in the *spring;* but the cleansing and renewal of the second temple by Judas Maccabæus. About 170 years B.C., Antiochus Epiphanes, a heathen King of Syria, persecuted the Jews, and in daring impiety matched his power against their God. He entered proudly into the temple, and took out the golden altar, and the table of shew-bread, and the golden candlestick; and profaned the temple; he raised an idol altar of burnt-offering, and offered upon it swine's flesh, and other unclean animals. It seemed in the sight of lookers-on as if he had indeed overcome the God of Israel. But no: in the midst of his pride, Judas Maccabæus, strong in faith, overthrew his forces, and cleansed the temple again, and rebuilt the altar, and dedicated it afresh to God: and it was to commemorate this renewal and re-dedication that he commanded the feast of the dedication to be observed year by year. If, then, our Lord Himself observed this feast, it must be our wisdom and our profit to observe everything we can that has been instituted by the Church or by holy men for our soul's good; God's blessing is most likely to rest on us if we do so.

Can we not see that it is good for us thus to be called to dedicate ourselves afresh to the service of God? What should we be, any of us, without fresh beginnings? The grace of perseverance is the very last grace, and, in the nature of things, the most difficult of all graces, that we obtain. How few lead a consistent life of loving, unswerving obedience from the beginning to the end! How many faint and grow weary! How many get ensnared in some deceitful sin! How many go far astray from their Father's home, to come back again, if they come back at all, like the prodigal, full of sorrow and misery for their wasted life! And even if, through God's mercy, we *are* walking in His ways, is it not a blessing to have fresh beginnings? Is it not a blessing to have our life made up of day succeeding day, instead of having it one long unbroken day? Does not each morning give us a fresh start in holy living, a golden opportunity of profiting even by the weaknesses and falls of yesterday? Does it not speak to us afresh of God—

> "New every morning is the love
> Our wakening and uprising prove;
> * * * *
> New mercies, each returning day,
> Hover around us while we pray;
> New perils past, new sins forgiven,
> New thoughts of God, new hopes of heaven"?

Again, is not the fresh beginning the Lord's day gives us week by week a great blessing? We may well believe that it does more than we are aware of to keep us from being too eager in our pursuit of the things of this world. The most deaf can hardly fail to hear it bidding them labour, not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life.

And is it not good for us to be called upon year by year to thank God for this His house with all its blessings? Are we not too apt to forget these great blessings, which through this presence of God amongst us are ours, and to live in the midst of them *un*blest, or blest only in scanty measure, when, if we did but open our hearts, God would bless us to the full? Is it not then good for us year by year to be called to consider whether we are what we ought to be *with God so near us?* If now, brethren, any of us feel uneasy about ourselves, are so entangled in sin, or so half-hearted in doing our duty, that we dare hardly hope that we are abiding in God's love, is there not a cause? If we had made a more faithful use of the services of God's house, come up to this house of our God more regularly, and made it, while here, a house of worship and prayer, would it not have been better with us now? If we had made a firmer stand against the many temptations to stay away from God's house for idle reasons, and if, when here, we had kept God in mind, and bent the knee and humbled the heart in prayer, ah! then it would have been different with us. But are we sorry that we have thus neglected God, and been wanting in reverence to Him? Then let us be thankful for our feast of dedication. Let us strive, God helping us, to make it a day of repentance and amendment and turning to God. If we have fallen into careless ways, let us begin to serve Him again,

If we *have* been serving Him, let us give ourselves to serve Him better.

Shall we not make the few days that yet remain before our dedication festival days of special prayer? Shall we not each day pray God that He will bless the observance of this festival; that He will pour out His Spirit upon this parish at this season, and put it into the hearts of all that can to come up to this His house on St. John Baptist's day, and dedicate themselves in sincerity and truth to His service? "My house shall be called a house of prayer for *all* people," saith God. Let us then pray that it may be to *all* a house of prayer. Most assuredly all who do dedicate themselves to God on that day, who do cleanse their hearts by repentance, and giving up all known sin give themselves wholly to God, keeping nothing back, will find mercy and favour with God. He who knoweth the heart, will see their secret desire and hearken to their prayer.

Perhaps we feel afraid thus solemnly to offer ourselves to God. The thought of our sins makes us afraid. We may well, such as we are, have such feelings. But shall we not take courage in the tender mercy of our God? The first service on St. John Baptist's day will be the Holy Communion of Christ's Body and Blood. In that Holy Sacrament we may have our souls cleansed and purified with that precious Blood that cleanseth from *all* sin. Are we then troubled at the recollection of our sins, at the consciousness of our unworthiness? What saith God to us, as He invites us to that Holy Table? "Come now, and let us reason together; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Though then our manifold sins make us unworthy, the sprinkling of the precious, all-cleansing Blood of Christ shall make us worthy. Surely there is no way of dedicating ourselves to God like that of doing so in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood: for then indeed we are not alone, but appear before God *in Christ:* then may we hope with a good hope that we shall be enabled to persevere. But if we may not on that day partake of that Holy Sacrament, let us at least be looking on to it, and preparing ourselves for it, and draw nigh to God in prayer and praise, giving ourselves to His service, to follow whithersoever He shall lead, to put our hand to the plough, never again to look back. Let us thus, one and all, make our prayer to God that our dedication feast may be a day of blessing to ourselves and to the whole parish; that God will give us grace to lay aside everything that keeps us from Him, everything that makes us backward to serve him; that on that day we may be found gathered here before Him; and that He will bless us according to our several needs: that so it may be a day in which He may both strengthen those that stand, and raise up them that fall.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. X. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1881.

MEETINGS have recently been held in London for the Abolition of the Government Regulation of Vice—a thing which, we believe, does not exist in this country. The Contagious Diseases Acts—the legislation thus untruly stigmatised—are restricted in their operation to the chief naval and military stations, and are designed solely to prevent a most fearful contagious disease, which besides breaking up the health of the patient himself, is always passed on to a future innocent wife and children, as well as to children's children for several generations. It is a disease which, unlike small-pox, requires actual contact for its propagation, and is often contracted by medical men and nurses who handle the sick. It has been known to be spread by vaccination, by kissing, by smoking an infected man's cigar, by drinking out of the same vessel, even though it be the cup in the Lord's Supper, These Acts have been most successful in preventing a terrible disease, and we cannot, after a most careful consideration of all the evidence that has been adduced, see anything unjust, immoral, or unscriptural in their provisions. Their main provision is that women in the scheduled districts, who make a trade of prostitution, are not allowed to carry on such a trade whilst they are in a state of disease, which they are sure to communicate to others; but are to be sent into hospital and treated at the public expense until they are cured. This is an interference with personal liberty, but not greater than that to which thousands of the poor who contract small-pox are subjected. The trade is also interfered with, but not one whit more so than any other dangerous trade. In fact, the great moral advantage of this legislation is that it restricts and discourages prostitution. We should be glad to see the Acts extended to all large towns. The persons who are agitating for their repeal are excellent, well-intentioned, and even sagacious people; but we scarcely think they

are alive to the fearful evils of free trade in prostitution and disease. The *Lancet* says of them :—

These optimist moralists will hear of no concession to weakness, and spurn the thought of conceding anything to the exigencies of our imperfect state. They would not have given so much as a cup of cold water to either of the impenitent thieves, and would have shrunk with horror from the prayer of the devils that they might pass into a herd of swine. Hagar might have perished with her ill-gotten babe in the wilderness ; Jonah would have been left to die in the sun, and the manslayer might have been overtaken by the avenger, before one of the agitators against Contagious Diseases Acts, or any other provision for lightening the so-called "penalties of sin," would have striven to help them. The argument would have been, these thieves deserve their punishment, and it will encourage others if we relieve their sufferings. These evil spirits have no claim to our compassion ; and we must, for example's sake, turn a deaf ear to their beseechings. If such characters as Hagar are relieved, and the children of their shame rescued from destitution, vice will be fostered. Those who take life must pay the penalty ; it will increase the crime to reduce the punishment ; even the disobedience of a prophet must be visited with its due recompense. This is precisely how the agitators argue against the Contagious Diseases Acts, against foundling asylums, and other measures to reduce the contingent social and personal effects and penalties of vice. It is no use trying to convince those who can find satisfaction in such reasoning.

THE HOLY COMMUNION : AT WHAT HOURS, AND HOW FREQUENTLY, SHOULD ITS PUBLIC CELEBRATION TAKE PLACE?

By D. L. H.

We propose to commence this paper with a brief discussion on the question, what is the most suitable time in the day for a celebration : after which, we will proceed to enquire how frequently it is desirable that such celebration should be held. As regards the former point, it may be premised that the circumstances of the *first institution* of this blessed Sacrament do not in any way determine the question, nor even throw light upon it. That the Holy Sacrament was *instituted* at an evening meal, is attributable solely to the conjunction of two special necessities, or, at least, expediencies : it was necessary, or at least expedient, that our Lord should "fulfil all righteousness" by eating the Paschal Supper, and this could not well have been eaten *before* the evening on which it *was* eaten ; indeed, even so, it is usually regarded as having been anticipatory, though that it was, in some sense, a *true Passover*, seems indisputable—"with desire I have desired to eat *this Passover* with you before I suffer :" and it was equally necessary, or, at least expedient, that our Lord should, as Augustine says, commend the greatness of the Holy Communion by fixing it in the hearts and memory of His disciples as the *last thing*, before He went from them to His Passion. And from the conjunction of these two necessities, or expediencies, arose the fact that Our Lord's last Paschal Supper, and His institution of the Holy Communion, took place at one and the same time. But this does not in the least determine the most suitable time for *us* to communicate. Nor do we find anything about it in the words of institution. And when St. Paul speaks of the Sacrament as κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, the Lord's Supper, we are not to conclude that the Sacrament is necessarily an *actual* supper, but only that that *name* is given to it, in memory of its first occasion. (See Chrysostom, as quoted in "Cave's Primitive Christianity," p. 164.) Thus, there is nothing about the circumstances of the institution which at all fixes the time. And hence it may be freely admitted that time is not an *essential* of the Sacrament : if there be absolute need, there may be private celebrations for the sick or dying at *any* hour : nay, there might conceivably be circumstances which would justify *public* celebration in the Church at *any*, no matter how unusual, time. But we shall here contend that *as a general rule* the *most suitable* time is the morning : preferably, the *early* morning : but certainly not later than the conclusion of morning prayer. For this we adduce the following reasons :—

First, the "post of honour," so to speak, is given by this practice, to the one service, of all others, to which honour is due. It is paying but poor reverence to this most holy rite, to relegate it to a late hour. Moreover, an early participation of the Holy Communion hallows all the rest of the day, and gives increased fervency and reality to any other devotions that may follow.

Secondly, the Holy Communion is a *memorial Sacrifice*: not, of course, a *new immolation* of Christ's Body—not a *Sacrificium suppletivum*, to supply any supposed defects in the one all-sufficient Sacrifice—but a *memorial* Sacrifice ; and that not only as being so *called*, because it reminds *us* of Christ's Sacrifice, but also as being a real *memorializing*, so to speak, of God the Father touching the Sacrifice which was offered for us ; a *re-presenting* before Him Christ's offering ; a *pleading* before Him Christ's meritorious sufferings. And *as* such a memorial Sacrifice, there is at least *primâ facie* plausibility in the view that our time of offering it up should make at any rate an *approximation* to the time at which Christ's Sacrifice was offered up. Now Christ was *offered—lifted up*—presented on the Cross—during the early morning hours : "it was the third hour, and they crucified Him." Here, then, is certainly one argument for morning Communion.

Thirdly, the Holy Communion has always been associated with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. We trace this association in the universal sentiment of the Church, that this blessed sacrament should always, provided they are fit and worthy to receive it, be administered to those who are mortally sick. And there is full Scriptural warrant for the association—vide St. John vi. 54, "Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life ; and *I will raise him up at the last day*." Now with this thought of *resurrection* the period of morning—the time of *sunrise*—the time of the *bursting forth of light*—has clearly a very close accord. Moreover, the thought of our *own* resurrection leads us to the thought of *Christ's* resurrection, on which, of course, our own resurrection depends : nay, the very connection between the Holy Communion and our own resurrection springs from the fact that in the Holy Communion we are made partakers of the Body of Him who rose. Indeed, that the Holy Communion has always borne more or less the character, not only

of a memorial of Christ's death, but also of a joy feast on His resurrection, seems proved by the fact—which we shall see further on—that *the special day* for its celebration has ever been *the Lord's Day—i.e.*, the day on which the Lord rose. Now, *Our Lord's* resurrection is not only like *our* resurrection, *suggestive* of morning, but it actually *occurred* in the morning—"very early in the morning they came to the sepulchre," and found that sepulchre empty, and Angels announcing "He is risen." For the celebration, then, of the Holy Feast, viewed in this aspect, there could scarcely be a more appropriate time. We may add that this argument is used by Cyprian against certain heretics who celebrated in the evening: he says, "we, by celebrating in the morning, commemorate the resurrection of the Lord."

Fourthly, we have Scriptural examples of early morning communion. The disciples at Tròas (see Acts xx.) listened to St. Paul till midnight; then came the miracle of the raising of Eutychus, which must have occupied some considerable time; and *then* St. Paul "broke bread," *i.e.*, celebrated the Holy Communion, and "talked a long while, even till break of day, and departed." And in the account of the shipwreck, in Acts xxvii., the use of the same liturgical words renders it probable that the food partaken of by St. Paul and his Christian còmpanions, "while the day was coming on" bore a Eucharistic character. The heathen soldiers and sailors, we observe, are said to have taken food, but *not* to have partaken of the bread St. Paul had broken. We may mention that the view here taken of both these passages is spoken of as tenable though not authoritatively endorsed by Professor Plumptre, in his scholarly article on the Lord's Supper, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

Fifthly, morning, and generally *early* morning communion was the all but universal practice in the Primitive Church during its purest ages. Testimonies to this are abundant. Pliny, the pro-consul of Bithynia, in his celebrated letter to the Emperor Trajan, speaks of the Christians meeting together before it was light, to sing hymns to Christ, and to bind themselves by a sacrament against the commission of any wickedness. Tertullian tells of their early celebrations—"*antelucanis cœtibus eucharisticam sumimus.*" Socrates, the historian, implies that a morning celebration was usual, by the extreme surprise which he expresses at the fact of there being *some* Christians in Egypt who celebrated in the evening. But it is unnecessary to multiply authorities on this point, as the assertion is seldom called into serious question.

Finally, there is a sixth reason which may be allowed to have weight, viz., that the practice of morning Communion is favourable to the very widespread sentiment that it is well to receive the sacred elements fasting, or at any rate in a state of abstinence. That this was the sentiment of the early Church, seems clear. See Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book XV., chapter vii. It is indeed sometimes objected that this could not have been the general feeling in the *Apostolic* age, as we see that the Holy Communion and the Agape, or Love-Feast, were then very closely connected. But to this it may be answered that there is nothing in this that is at all inconsistent with the feeling alluded to, inasmuch as properly speaking the Agape *followed*, and did not *precede* the Holy Communion. The letter of Pliny, mentioned above, may fairly be said to refer to the Apostolic age, most authorities dating it but a very few years after the death of the last Apostle, St. John; and in this letter, after the account already given of the Sacrament, it is added that the custom then is to *depart* from the place of meeting, and by-and-by to *meet again* to partake of an innocent entertainment common to all. Moreover, the Apostolic practice in this respect would be likely to follow the analogy of the Jewish worship; and the Jews, as we are well reminded in Jeremy Taylor's "Worthy Communicant," "did religiously abstain from meat and drink upon all their solemn feasts, till their great offices of religion were finished." It is true that St. Paul's expressions in 1 Cor. xi., seem to imply that in the Corinthian Church the Agape preceded the Eucharist; but it is by no means certain that the passage must necessarily bear that meaning; and in any case it is plain that the whole practice of the Corinthian Church on this matter was corrupt—"in this that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse." So that we may fairly conclude that the *purest* traditions of the Apostolic age are more in favour of than against the practice of fasting Communion. And when we come to succeeding ages, the voice of the Church on the subject is clear—witness the Canon of the Council of Carthage, which enacts that "the Sacrament of the Altar should only be celebrated by fasting people." This, of course, we quote not as binding upon ourselves, but as showing the opinion of that time. See also Augustine's comment on that Canon, in which he says that "it pleased the Holy Ghost that, for the honour of so great a Sacrament, the Lord's body should enter into the mouth of a Christian before any other food: and therefore," he continues, "this custom is observed by the whole world, *per universum orbem mos iste servatur.*" Thus the judgment of Catholic antiquity seems decided in the matter. And surely there are rational grounds for the practice of abstinence before Communion. "By natural reason and experience, we find that they pray and worship best who are not loaden with meat and drink; and that therefore this solemnity, being the greatest worship of God in the whole religion, consequently ought to be done with all advantages." Such is the quaint, but shrewd, remark of Jeremy Taylor; and it forms no bad argument for early Communion. To insist indeed upon an *absolute* fast before Communion may, perhaps, savour somewhat of superstition, and it appears to the present writer that the *spirit* of this reverent and devout sentiment is not broken by partaking, if necessary, before communicating, of the usual simple morning meal; but it certainly *is* broken if we defer our Communion until after those solid and substantial repasts which the natural and proper requirements of most people lead them to consume later on in the day.

So much for the time of day at which the celebration should be held. We will now proceed to the *second* question with which we have to deal: the question, namely, how often celebrations should recur. There is no doubt that *frequency* of celebration is implied in the very words of institution, "Do this *as oft* as ye shall drink it in remembrance of Me." But the question still remains, *how* often should it be done.

Some will answer "daily," and there is much to be said for that answer. If, it may be urged, it be good

to communicate at all, it must be good to do so as frequently as possible: indeed, some authorities go so far as to interpret the prayer, "Give us this day our *daily* bread," after a mystical manner, as referring to this holy Feast; and Scriptural sanction for daily communion is said to be found in Acts ii. 46, "they, continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house." It was undoubtedly the practice in many ancient churches, notably in that of Carthage, as we learn from the writings of Cyprian: and Augustine bears testimony that there were many places where it prevailed. Our own English Church in her rubric about the "many Priests and Deacons" in Collegiate Churches, &c., all receiving the Communion "*every Sunday at the least*" may well be thought to imply that there will at any rate be more than one celebration in the week. Also the rubric before the proper Prefaces evidently contemplates the possibility of a daily celebration during the Octave of these special Feasts, and daily Communion is very widely practised in the Church at this present time—more widely, perhaps, than some of us are aware. In Mackeson's Guide to the London Churches for the present year (a work published by authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury and several Bishops), it is stated that of eight hundred and seventy-seven churches in London and its neigbourhood, there is a daily celebration in forty-three, that is, in about one in every twenty. And there are many country districts—especially among our fashionable watering-places—of which probably the same might be said. And it must be admitted that many of the ordinary arguments against daily celebrations are not to the point, for they are arguments against the ordinary Christian receiving the Sacrament daily; whereas the question is not whether the ordinary Christian should receive every day, but whether there should not be *a daily public celebration*, which now some, now others, might attend. But though there is thus much to be said for a daily celebration, the considerations on the other side are probably of greater weight. Although, as has been remarked, the holding of a daily celebration does not necessarily urge a daily reception on ordinary Christians, yet it plainly encourages it; and such reception is fraught with grave dangers. There is the danger of irreverence—nay, of contempt. As has been well observed, the manna, the bread which fell from Heaven every day, was at last slighted and despised: and so might the Bread of the Lord's Body be. And there are the opposite dangers of formalism and spiritual pride. The interpretation of the clause in the Lord's Prayer, given above, is fanciful; and as to apostolic practice, what was suitable in order to keep up the zeal of the faithful to the highest possible pitch at that time of need and danger, may not be equally so now. And though, as we have said, the practice prevailed in *some* parts of the Primitive Church, yet it clearly did not in all, and we glean from the writings of the fathers that disputes about its advisability were manifold. Altogether, then, though we perhaps should not *condemn* the practice, we should surely hesitate to pronounce definitely in its favour.

But the case is different as regards a *weekly* celebration, on the Lord's day. *This* seems plainly incumbent on the Church. Any student of the New Testament will allow the special association of the "breaking of bread" with the Lord's day—the first day of the week. And if it be said that this Scriptural authority need not here carry any more weight than we allowed it in the case of daily celebration, we answer that the Scriptural authority for *weekly* celebration is backed up by a cogent argument drawn from the very *institution* of the sacred rite. It is the *one and only service distinctly ordained and appointed by Our Lord:* and to keep a special day in His honour, calling it, after Him, *the* Lord's Day, and on that day to perform in His name various services of *man's* devising, while omitting the one service that He bequeathed, seems almost like a mockery of His command. Moreover, if we turn to the Primitive Church, we shall find that the practice of Weekly Communion was not only, like that of daily Communion, prevalent, but that it may be pronounced to have been all but universal. (See the evidence of many ancient canons, and decrees of councils and synods, to this effect, well drawn out in Bingham's great work, already referred to, Book xv. Chapter ix.) And the same thing may be proved by the fact that every detailed description that has come down to us of the Sunday services in those ages, from that of Justin Martyr downwards, includes a description of the Eucharist. The voices, then, of Scripture, reason, and Catholic antiquity, unite in recommending weekly communion on the Lord's Day. And in this we may fairly include—where local circumstances are favourable—ordinary Holy Days. Such days, being commemorations of Saints, that is, glorified members of Christ's mystical Body, the Church, the feast upon Christ's Body is peculiarly appropriate to their Festivals. And of course great days in the Christian year, kept as memorials of important events in the Lord's earthly life, are to be counted as eminently Lord's days, and duly honoured by the Lord's own Feast.

To this rule, however, we should probably make the exception of the more pronounced and solemn Fasts. And most of us would agree that we should especially except "Good Friday." Not but what, in a recent correspondence in a well-known Church newspaper, many plausible reasons are given for Good Friday celebrations. It is urged that no day can be more appropriate for the *memorial* of Christ's death than the day on which we commemorate the death itself. And it is said that the usual *ritual* argument against such celebration in our Church, viz., that there is no proper preface appointed which we might have looked for on so great a day, had our Church intended a celebration to be held then—it is said that this argument is at best only inferential, and by no means conclusive. Our Reformers only made a certain selection out of the mass of proper prefaces in the mediæval service books; and many excellent Churchmen have celebrated on Good Friday—notably the celebrated Bishop Andrewes, author of the "Devotions," who is known, as an historical fact, to have celebrated on Good Friday, 1597. The sermon preached by him on that occasion is yet extant. In it he expressly mentions the Holy Sacrament, and gives the advice to his hearers, "respice et recipe." And the late Bishop Wilberforce, though we are not aware that he ever personally celebrated on Good Friday, yet pronounced an opinion that would justify that practice. He said he conceived it to be the duty of a priest to be ready to celebrate the Communion on every day for which there is a proper Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed. And in proof that a very high view of the Eucharist is not incompatible with Good Friday celebrations, we have the fact that in, at least, one church mentioned in this correspondence, there is, or used lately to be, a Good Friday celebration with the

accessories of lights, incense, and vestments. But, for all this, the prevailing sentiment of the Church is, and we think rightly, against Good Friday Communion. The Holy Communion is, in no small measure, a *feast*, and, as such, seems entirely out of character with the most solemn of all fasts. Moreover, there is a special cause for the exception of Good Friday, and, indeed, of Easter Eve, from the list of Communion days. It has been well expressed in the following words: —"The main reason for this exception is what we may conveniently describe as the historical dramatic principle of public worship, whereby the Church endeavours to recall, as it were, the very days and events commemorated, rather than merely to remind her children of them as past. Thus we deal with Christmas Day, Easter Day, and Ascension Day, notably in hymns, as though not anniversaries, but as the actual times of contemporary events, to which we are called as spectators and sympathisers. We therefore omit Communion on Good Friday and Holy Saturday, precisely because our Lord was absent in the flesh from the Church militant on these two days, that we may so far throw ourselves back in spirit to the position and sorrow of the Apostles. And further, as regards Good Friday, the day of the actual Atonement, the inferior priests refrain, as in the ancient Jewish rights, from offering the Sacrifice when the Great High Priest is singly making the one oblation. While He is, so to speak, actually on the Cross, no other celebrant is possible." Such are reasons against Good Friday celebration; and surely they are of great weight.

Upon the whole, then, it appears to us that, in ordinary circumstances, a morning celebration on every Lord's Day, and other great commemorative days, with the exception of great Fasts, and especially of Good Friday, is most in accordance with the nature, history, and use of this Holy rite, and with this we conclude this paper, hoping it may lead to a full discussion on the points which have been raised.

THE OBJECTS OF BERKELEY'S LIFE.

(Continued from page 308.)

III. We now pass to the most remarkable, and in many ways the most admirable scene in Berkeley's life.

Soon after returning from his travels he had been appointed in rapid succession, first to the Deanery of Dromore, worth £500 per annum, and then to that of Derry, worth £1500. We now find him eager to cast away this rich post, eager to renounce all his future prospects of preferment, and to take instead perpetual exile, £100 a year, and the chance of evangelising America. Saddened by the universal corruption and godlessness of the Old World, he turned with longing gaze towards the undeveloped promise of the New; here lay the site of future empire, the home of races destined to play great parts in the history of the world; what a glorious task it would be for him to help to shape their destinies aright, to sow among them the seeds of holiness and culture.

His plan was, as he wrote to Lord Percival, to found a college in the Bermudas, where the English youth of the Colonies might be educated so as to become useful pastors among their countrymen; and where a number of young American savages might also be educated; and being thus well instructed in the Christian religion, practical mathematics, the liberal arts and sciences, and imbued with public-spirited principles, they would become the fittest instruments for spreading religion, morals, and civil life among their countrymen.

The marvellous success with which Dean Berkeley planned and matured his project, will give us some idea of the power of his presence and his words. First in Ireland he won as volunteers for the work some of the "hopefullest young clergymen, and others, many of them well provided for, and all in the fairest way of promotion." Then in England his earnest pleading made even the coldest enthusiastic in the cause. The members of the Scriblerus Club, who had agreed to rally him on his visionary scheme, were so struck by the way in which he urged its claims, that with one accord they rose up saying, "Let us set out with him immediately." He went often to Court, as he himself said, not because he loved Courts, but because he loved America, and he was an influential favourite with the King and Queen. The noblemen both in town and country threw open their houses, eager for his company. He was welcomed everywhere with affection and respect. Subscriptions poured in from every quarter. The greatest achievement of all, was his winning over the House of Commons under a minister like Walpole. He personally canvassed every individual member, and at last, with only two dissentient voices, a charter was granted for the College at Bermuda, and the Commons voted a sum of twenty thousand pounds. Without waiting for the payment of the money, Berkeley sailed upon his mission of "godlike benevolence"; he landed after a weary voyage at Newport, in Rhode Island; but Bermuda he was never destined to see. From the first Walpole had determined that the money should never be paid. For nearly three years Berkeley lingered in Rhode Island, monthly expecting to hear that all was arranged; hope grew fainter and fainter as time went on, till at last it was completely extinguished by a hint of Walpole's, to the effect that there was no possible chance of obtaining the grant. There was now nothing to be done but to return. Broken in health and spirits, Berkeley sailed from New England in the autumn of 1731.

IV. But little time is left to look at Berkeley as a Bishop; for such through very shame he was made upon his return from America, in spite (we use the phrase advisedly) of his well-known carelessness of politics or favour. It was a time when the aims of bishops were chiefly two, to make fortunes, and to take prominent parts in ruling Ireland. Their occupations, in consequence, were chiefly two also; viz., making speeches in Parliament, and winning friends at Court. What a contrast to such men as these do we find in Berkeley, a Bishop so careless of politics that he only once attended Parliament, so regardless of promotion, that he firmly refused it when offered. Earnestly he set himself to carry out at Cloyne the objects at which he had aimed through life. His love of God and man went hand in hand. In discharging the duties of a Christian Bishop, he was both glorifying God and benefiting his fellow-men. His mornings were spent in close study; medicinal theories, acute maxims on political economy, and philosophical treatises, alike flowed from his pen; the afternoons were devoted to practical work. As the ruler of his diocese the Bishop showed his administrative ability in a manner very rare in those days. He regularly visited the various parishes under his care, for the purpose of holding Confirmations; and he took steps

towards keeping himself thoroughly informed of the needs of the diocese, by reviving the obsolete office of Rural Dean. As a pastor dwelling among his people, he seized every opportunity of showing the love he felt for them. The tastes of the gentry were refined by the examples of first-class painting and music with which they became familiar at the palace. The wants of the poor were attended to with untiring care. The Bishop was employer, magistrate, and doctor for all the country round. He gave them labour when they needed it, shielded them from the robbers who from time to time infested the neighbourhood, and himself attended them in their illnesses. Differences of religion made no difference in the Bishop's kindness; he looked upon all as his people, and served their interests with all his power.

Thus briefly we have attempted to state the objects of Berkeley's life, and the consistent, faithful way in which he strove to accomplish them. In conclusion we would wish to draw attention to the attempt which is being made to erect a suitable memorial to this noble Bishop. Though Berkeley has been dead one hundred and twenty-seven years, the visitor to Cloyne still asks in vain for any monument of him in his own cathedral. A time like the present, when his world-renowned writings are again stirring the current of philosophic thought, seems to us a fitting opportunity for remedying this long neglect. Particulars of the movement, which is supported in a very influential way, will be found in our advertising columns, and we heartily commend it to the generosity of our readers.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE USE OF THE REVISED VERSION.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Inasmuch as you press for the use of this Version in church, because it is the more accurate rendering of the Word of God, and there is no legal prohibition against it, the question raised rather than settled by Lord Selborne's letter in the *Times* of the 3rd inst. has become one of such interest, that any one who thinks that he can contribute anything to its solution, may perhaps claim a right to submit his contribution, with a *valeat quantum*, to the judgment of his brethren.

It is admitted that the assertion that what we know as the Authorised Version is "appointed to be read in churches" rests on no other extant evidence than the title-page which asserts it, *i.e.*, of the first printers of the Version and their successors.

It is inferred, however, that there must have been some sufficient basis for this assertion, such as an Order in Council, or proclamation, the records of which have been destroyed by a fire in A.D. 1618, or other casualty. The assertion, it is further urged, was never questioned, as it probably would have been had it been made without authority. Only on that assumption can we explain, it is said, the substitution of the Version of 1611 for "the Bible of the largest volume" ordered by the Canons of 1604 to be placed in every church.

From this series of probable inferences it is inferred further that the Version of 1611 is so far in rightful possession of our Churches, the ideal Order in Council being recognised by implication in the Act of Uniformity, that it cannot be dislodged without the authority of an Act of Parliament.

Some facts seem to me worth weighing, though I do not say that they are decisive, in the opposite scale:—

1. There is no evidence that there was any Order in Council appointing the Bishops' Bible of A.D. 1571 to be read in churches. Convocation in 1571 and 1604 ordered it be provided for all churches, and this rather than an Order in Council seems to have been the normal process.

2. Bishop Andrewes, preaching before the King down to A.D. 1624, almost uniformly takes his text from the Geneva Bible, and not from that of A.D. 1611. Is not this fact fair presumptive evidence that there had been no Order in Council positively appointing another Version?

3. Laud's Visitation *Articles* in 1622 and 1628 require a Bible "of the latest edition" to be provided. Does not this look like an attempt to make up by personal or ecclesiastical authority for the lack of any formal document such as an Order in Council?

4. I note that the Puritan divines at the Savoy Conference, when they urge that the Epistles and Gospels in the Prayer-book should be taken from the Version of A.D. 1611, speak of it as "the new translation *allowed* by authority" (Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 307). Is this the way in which they would have been likely to describe a Version that had been *imposed* by authority? Do not these facts, taken together, make it doubtful whether there ever was an Order in Council, or, if there was, whether it were more than a permissive measure? If it had been compulsory, should we not have had, it may be asked, some record of the grievance it must have been to many parishes to be compelled to buy a new Bible within a few years after they had paid a considerable sum for that of the "largest volume" ordered by the Canons of A.D. 1604?

I am far from thinking it desirable that individual clergymen should introduce the Revised Version at their discretion. But the legal position of one who should so use it, with or without the sanction of his Bishop, is a matter which, sooner or later, unless some action, compulsory or permissive, is taken by the Bishops collectively, or by Convocation, or by Order in Council, or by Parliament, must be decided one way or other; and it may be well to anticipate that decision by such action. Men are not likely to be content to go on for years reading what a general consent may pronounce to be a worse Version when a better is accessible, and it would be an evil day for the Church of England if a clergyman were to be prosecuted, suspended, or deprived, because he felt himself bound in conscience to read the better.

E. H. PLUMPTRE.

Bickley Vicarage, June 28, 1881.

Professor Stubbs has been elected a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Thomas Carlyle.

Bishop Ryan, whose recent appointment to the vicarage of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, caused so much feeling in the parish, has resigned the preferment, and accepted that of Middleham, in order, the *Morning Post* states, that he may afford help to the Bishop of Ripon in the discharge of his Episcopal duties.

The Church of England Pulpit.

ORDINATION SERMON.

By the Rev. FRANCIS KING, D.D.,
ex-Scholar Trinity College, Dublin.

Sermon Preached in Holywood Church, Co. Down, on Trinity Sunday, June 12, 1881.

"And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building."—1 Kings vi. 7.

THE desire that was uppermost in the mind of the good King David, as soon as the Lord had subdued the nations round about, and given him rest from war, was to build an house for God. It came between him and his sleep. "Lord, remember David and all his trouble: how he sware unto the Lord, and vowed unto the mighty God of Jacob, Surely I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed; I will not give sleep to mine eyes, or slumber to my eye-lids, until I have found out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob."

But that honour was not allowed him, mixed up as his life had been with war and shedding of blood. For his son Solomon, a peaceful prince, it was reserved to build the temple. "Behold a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest, and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about, for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days; he shall build an house for My name." Such was God's message to King David. But, though thus debarred himself from undertaking the work, he set about making all necessary preparations for it. He left nothing undone to procure all that was most precious in materials or most skilful in men, for the great project in his mind. He called his son, while he "was young and tender." He laid before him his plans for the building, which was to be "exceeding magnifical of fame and of glory, throughout all countries." He points out to him the materials he had collected: "Now, behold, in my trouble I have prepared for the house of the Lord, an hundred thousand talents of gold, and a thousand thousand talents of silver; and of brass and iron without weight; for it is in abundance; timber also and stone have I prepared, and thou mayest add thereto. Moreover there are workmen with thee in abundance, hewers and workers of stone and timber, and all manner of cunning men for every manner of work. Of the gold, the silver, the brass and the iron, there is no number. Arise, therefore, and be doing, and the Lord be with thee."

So when Solomon set about the building everything was ready prepared by his pious father; and he would have "with him, for all manner of workmanship, every willing skilful man, for any manner of service." The site of this magnificent edifice was Mount Moriah. The temple covered a square of three hundred and four yards on each side. And lest there might be any pollution from unknown graves beneath, almost the whole of this space was arched under ground. For "if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy." It was built on the model of the tabernacle; and of both God Himself was the great architect. "All this, said David, the Lord made me understand in writing, by His hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern."*

The foundation was laid A.M. 2992, and it was in building seven years and six months. Every stone was previously prepared, marked and numbered in the remote quarry, so as to fit into the exact place it was designed to occupy in the building; and so, as the Temple arose in its majestic proportions, a solemn and impressive silence reigned all round; and "there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building."

The parallel between the building of Solomon's temple and that of the heavenly Zion, "Jerusalem, the quiet habitation, the tabernacle that shall not be taken down," "the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," is plain, obvious, and Scriptural. "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."† Of such materials is that temple composed, which, like that of Solomon is being built silently, gradually, imperceptibly. God is the great architect. Jesus Christ is the chief corner stone. The Apostles and Prophets, the foundation on which it is built. This world, with all its sorrows, and all its sins, all its confused noise, its disorder and disorganization, is but the quarry out of which the stones are taken, and in which they are fitted for the heavenly temple. Believers constitute that spiritual building, saints on earth and saints in heaven, "for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." "Ye also," says St. Peter,‡ "are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." "Ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building."

And who are they to whom is entrusted the

* 1 Chron. xxviii. 19. † Ephes. ii. 19, etc. ‡ 1, ii. 5.

awfully solemn and responsible office of building up this spiritual temple? They are such as the Apostle enumerates among the coronation gifts of the Saviour, when "He ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things. And He gave some apostles, some prophets; and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying"—or (as it is translated in the New Version), "for the building up"—"of the Body of Christ. Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect Man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."* Such were the gifts of Christ to His Church.

"Out of men thus endued with the gifts of the Spirit on their conversion to the Christian faith," says Hooker, "the Church had her ministers chosen, unto whom was given ecclesiastical power by Ordination." But no one will assert that these gifts were all to die out in one generation. No, these gifts and offices, as far as transmissible, were to be transmitted "to faithful men, able to teach others also." "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

And our Church, in the preface to the Ordinal, affirms that, "It is evident to all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' times there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer and imposition of hands were approved and admitted thereto by lawful authority."

And our great privilege it is to be called to minister in a Church, which while retaining the "Apostles' doctrine and fellowship," can trace back her succession and her orders as no other Church in the land can do, to the ancient Church of Ireland, to her honoured saints of olden times, and to primitive antiquity. And so, when it seemed fit to our rulers to spoil us of our inheritance, to strip our Church of all that man could deprive her of; to commence and to inaugurate a system of confiscation, which, as over and over again we warned them at the time, was infectious, and only the beginning of troubles, the sowing of the seed, of which the bitter crop is now springing up, still they were forced to leave us a noble heritage, which they could not wrench from us, our title as "The Church of Ireland." A Church so pure in doctrine, so Catholic and Apostolic, that John Wesley declared of the then united Church, "I dare not separate from the Church; I believe it would be a sin to do so." And, in a sermon preached on the occasion of his last visit to Ireland, two years before his death, he thus warns his followers: "Though ye have and will have a thousand temptations to leave the Church and set up for yourselves, regard them not; be Church of England men still; do not cast away the peculiar glory which God hath put upon you, and frustrate the design of Providence, the very end for which God raised you up." And elsewhere in his works he says: "I fear when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them." Dr. Chalmers, no mean authority, comparing the Churches in England, Scotland, and Ireland, says of the latter: "The truth is, among the established Churches of our empire, that of Ireland, in the vital and spiritual sense of the term, is the most prosperous of the three. While its outward man perisheth, its inward man is renewed day by day. The hand of power may strip it of its temporalities, but we trust that its indomitable spirit in the cause of a pure and Scriptural faith will not be so easily quelled. Though despoiled of their rights, they will not abandon their duties." And testimonies of a similar kind from candid and large-hearted outsiders might easily be multiplied.

And now after she has emerged from an ordeal unprecedented even in her chequered history, after "she has endured a great fight of afflictions while she was made a gazing stock, both by reproaches and afflictions, may she not claim more than ever the dutiful loyalty, affection, and devotion of her children?

This church you, who are ordained to-day, are called to serve, and to build her walls in troublous times. "And the work is great, for the palace is not for man, but for the Lord God." No words of mine can add anything to the solemn admonitions in the ordination services. Yet bear with me while—as one who has had long experience in the ministry of our beloved church—I endeavour to fulfil the duty assigned to me by that church to-day. That is, to declare both to priests and deacons "their duty and office, and also how the people ought to esteem them in their office." And how can I do this more effectually than by reminding you that you have this day devoted yourselves to the most glorious of all undertakings, the building of the spiritual temple, which through all eternity, is to be "the habitation of God through the spirit"?

"Let a man so account of us as the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God; moreover it is required in stewardship that a man be found faithful." This faithfulness ordination cannot confer on us. It can only give us authority to be stewards. "Authority to teach publicly in the church," says Archbishop Whately, "in the sense of a legal right to exercise that function, is

* Ephes. iv. 11-13.

given to every ordained person by the act of ordination itself. But authority in the sense of weight or claim to deference belongs to him, only so far as he is qualified to teach by intellectual or moral fitness, and of this ordination should serve as a solemn recognition and outward token. The case is similar in a civil office. The delivery of the great seal makes a man Lord Chancellor, and thereby gives him 'authority' that is a legal right to pronounce judgments in court, which shall be binding on the parties; but it does not make him a good lawyer. His 'opinion' upon any legal question is neither the better nor the worse for his high dignity, and his 'authority' in that sense is manifestly just the same the day after he has resigned the seals as when he held them. Again, the solemn setting a man apart to the ministry of the word is not that which *makes* him able to discharge that office. It only recognises his previous ability, declares his qualification for that great work, and gives him permission to engage in it, just as the Queen's image and superscription do not make the metal they are stamped upon pure gold and silver, but only assure us of the weight and purity of the piece, and render it a convenient medium of exchange."

"The Holy Ghost," says Hooker, in reply to those who objected to the words of the ordinal, "Receive the Holy Ghost," "may be used to signify not the person alone, but the gifts of the Holy Ghost, such as authority and power which is given men in the church to be ministers of holy things. And therefore he which giveth this power may without folly or absurdity say, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' such power as the Spirit of Christ has endued His church withal—such power as neither prince nor potentate, king nor Cæsar on earth can give."

If our ministry is not to be blamed we must "give no offence in anything"; but "in all things approve ourselves as the ministers of God, by pureness, by knowledge, by long suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left."*

Such are the qualifications of those who are to be watchmen, stewards, ambassadors for Christ; of those who are to build the heavenly temple, and *to be "unto God a sweet savour of Christ;* in them that are saved and in them that perish; to the one the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?"

Henceforth your chosen office will be to be "labourers together with God," over those who are "God's husbandry, God's building." The foundation has been laid, others have laboured, and you are called to enter upon their labours. Stone after stone has been added to the building, saint after saint has passed away, but the building is still incomplete. It awaits still the time when "He shall bring forth the headstone with shoutings, Grace, grace unto it." For this "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now," "waiting for the adoption—to wit, the redemption of our body." Your office it will henceforth be, "to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever."

Your bounden duty it will be, "never to cease your labour, your care and diligence to bring all such as are or shall be committed to your charge, unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ that there shall be no place left among you, either for error in religion or viciousness in life." Doing all we can, faithful as we may be, the sheep will stray. How often is it the sad complaint of the hard working and diligent pastor—

> Lord, in thy fold I work all day,
> I read, I watch, I warn, I pray;
> And yet these wilful, wandering sheep
> Within Thy fold I cannot keep.
>
> I journey, yet no step is won—
> Alas, the weary course I run:
> Like sailors shipwreck'd in their dreams,
> All powerless and benighted seems.

False guides will endeavour to attract from the sober and reverent and wholesome pastures which our church provides, to the fascinating though noxious fields of excitement, novelty, and pleasure. How painful it is to the anxious shepherd to find the flock he has so carefully tendered led away from his fold by the voice of any stranger, any self-constituted shepherd, of whose character or qualifications they know absolutely nothing.

But what if it shall happen that any member do take any hurt or hindrance by reason of his negligence? What if by any blemish in the pastor's walk or conversation he help to drive his flock from the fold? What if in him whose lips should retain knowledge, and from whom his people justly look for "simplicity and godly sincerity," for "gravity, sincerity, sound speech," they see nothing but gaiety, frivolity, and worldliness?

What if they find him "at whose mouth they should seek the law, and who by his office is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts" not "a pattern of believers, but a lover of pleasure more than a lover of God"? Frequenting the "house of feasting" much oftener than "the house of mourning"; spending his time in pleasure parties or at lawn tennis when the summons to the bed of the sick and dying is left neglected?

What if the Sunday sermon be the only ministerial effort of the week? What if while all other professional men are busy, the pastor is the only idle man in the parish? What if he moves among his flock with nothing of ministerial character, with no apparent desire to elevate or to evangelise, "to

* 2 Cor. vi. 3.

allure to brighter worlds and lead the way"? What if the laborious and less ostentatious and less pretentious work of house-to-house visitation be utterly neglected, if "the fatherless and widows in their affliction" be unvisited? What if his motive be, "Put me into the priest's office that I may eat bread"; if as soon as ever he is admitted to priest's orders his sole aim be to get "a parish"; where, if it be a large and important sphere, it is hard to say whether the appointment will be more unfortunate for the pastor or for the flock? Or if it be a small one, he settles down to *begin* his ministry where he ought to *end* it? Horticulture, or agriculture, a life of ease, of idleness, and pleasure, thenceforth his ministry. And I regret to say the present mode of appointment to parishes, and the exigencies of our church, have done much to foster this unfortunate state of things, and to thrust young and inexperienced clergymen into positions either of importance or of ease, which under a better system of patronage should be assigned to men of experience in the ministry, or to those who have "borne the heat and burden of the day." What if the apostolic precept, "Give attention to reading," be wholly neglected, and the Sunday discourse be consequently dry and poor and meagre, a mere stringing together of a few oft-reiterated texts? Or it may be the young clergyman, finding he has nothing to do, is either a regular absentee from his parish, and the few sheep are left in the wilderness, and the cure of souls assigned to a "locum tenens." Or absent the whole week, the shepherd returns on Saturday for "Sunday duty." What account will such a shepherd render when the Master who has hired him gives His directions, "Call, not the indolent nor the idle, but the *labourers*," when the "chief shepherd" puts the question, "Where is the flock that was given thee, thy beautiful flock?" Well does the Christian poet admonish us all—

> But chiefly ye should lift your gaze
> Above the world's uncertain haze,
> And look with calm, unwavering eye,
> On the bright fields beyond the sky,
> Ye who our Lord's commission bear;
> His way of mercy to prepare;
> "Angels" he calls you—be your strife,
> To lead on earth an angel's life.
>
> Think not of rest; though dreams be sweet,
> Start up and ply your heavenward feet,
> Is not God's oath upon your head,
> Ne'er to sink down on slothful bed,
> Never again your loins untie,
> Nor let your torches waste and die,
> Till when the shadows thickest fall,
> Ye hear your Master's midnight call?

Builders of the spiritual temple we are indeed called to be. But "Let every man take heed how he buildeth thereon; for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall escape, yet so as by fire."* Let us never lose sight of this solemn warning. The work may be burned, and the builder, if he escape at all, yet barely escapes, as from an house in flames. He saves nothing from the conflagration.

The man knows the truth, he builds on "the Church's one foundation;" but his ministry, from any or from a variety of causes, is unprofitable. His doctrine possibly is sound, his sermons orthodox, clear as the sun, it may be, but cold as the moon; there is no sympathy between him and his flock; no following out of the work, during the week; "no building up of believers in their most holy faith." And as far as his ministry is concerned it is a failure: the building is composed of perishable materials, wood, hay, stubble. There are no "corner stones polished after the similitude of a palace," for the temple in Heaven. He is saved; but tested by the fire, the work is burned up, and there are none who shall be his "joy and hope and crown of rejoicing." None to whom he can say in prospect of the coming day of judgment, "Ye are our glory and our joy."

May we as ministers all realise more and more the picture which Christian saw in "Interpreter's" house, "A very grave person, his eyes lifted up to heaven, the best of books in his hand, the law of truth written on his lips, the world behind his back. He stood as if he pleaded with men, and a crown of Gold did hang over his head."

Pardon me if as one standing before that picture, I have endeavoured to address you to-day, and in doing so, have used great plainness of speech. My message to those to-day about to be "ordained to any holy function," is, "Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it." "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in so doing, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Here we have concise rules laid down for our guidance, as to our personal character our parochial work and our pulpit addresses. "Study to show thyself approved unto God," then we shall view any temporary popularity of very secondary importance, and man's judgment of trifling account. As to our pastoral work in our parish, "a workman that need not be ashamed." And as to our pulpit ministrations, "Rightly dividing the word of truth." Make this your aim, and God will honour your ministry, and give you souls for your hire, and seals to your ministry. And though you may not be able to parade your converts; and though

* 1 Cor. iii. 10-15.

your hands may often "hang down and your knees be feeble," yet when in the worst of times "They that feared the Lord spake often one to another: the Lord hearkened and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before Him for them that feared the Lord and that thought upon His name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him,"* you shall hear at last the joyful sentence, "Well done thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

So far I have dwelt on the duties of the minister; I may not conclude without a word to the people to whom they minister. If the office of the builder be so weighty and dignified, how precious must the temple be! "Ye are God's building." "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and your spirit, which are God's."† All these gifts of our ascended Lord are "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect Man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ."

How far has His work of grace, His merciful purpose, been fulfilled in you? How far are you becoming more and more "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of saints in light"? When your place here shall know you no more, where will be your place hereafter? "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is New Jerusalem, which cometh down from heaven from my God; and I will write upon him my new name."‡ "They that were ready went in with him to the marriage, and the doors were shut." The stones for the temple were "made ready beforehand." "He that is unjust let him be unjust still; and he that is holy let him be holy still." "He hath made us meet for the inheritance of the saints in light."

And how should we esteem a godly ministry? The Apostle says,§ "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation, Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." And in the same chapter, "Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief; for this is unprofitable for you." Ours is a laborious and responsible office; we ask your sympathy and prayers. It is easy to taunt us with idleness, if there be no other reproach to cast against us. "Ye are idle," has been the cry against God's servants since the time of Moses; but, in truth, many a labourer might adopt the language of the saintly Baxter, when some taunted him with idleness, "The worst I wish you is, that you had my ease instead of your labour. I have reason to take myself for the least of all saints, and yet I fear not to tell the answer, that I take the labour of most tradesmen to be a pleasure to the body in comparison to mine, though I would not exchange it with the greatest prince. Their labour preserveth health, but mine consumeth it. They work in ease and I in continual pain. They have hours and days of recreation: I have scarce time to eat and drink. Nobody molesteth these for their labour, but the more I do the more hatred and trouble I draw on me."

It is easy to criticise our discourses, or to find fault with our ministry; but we are apt to forget, both ministers and people, the conspicuous position which, more than any other man in the community, the clergyman occupies. "Ye are the light of the world; a city that is set on a hill cannot be hid." "Very different degrees of indulgence," says the orator of Rome, "are conceded to different classes of men. If they who spend their lives sunk in obscurity have committed any error, few know it—their fame and their fortune are alike. But it fares far otherwise with those in higher positions: if they err in any way, all men know it. So where the position is highest the license allowed and the indulgence is least." "Brethren pray for us." God's promise to His turning and praying children is, "I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding."* "I will clothe her priests with salvation, and her saints shall shout aloud with joy."†

So, when their work is finished here,
May they in hope their charge resign;
So when their Master shall appear,
May they with crowns of glory shine."

The parish church of All Saints', Fulham, which has been rebuilt at a cost about £9,000, will be consecrated by the Bishop of London to-day, at 2.30 p.m. The Archbishop of Canterbury will give an address after the consecration.

* Malachi iii. 16-17. † 1 Cor. vi. 19. ‡ Rev. iii. 12. § Heb. xiii. 7.

* Jer. iii. 15. † Ps. cxxxii. 16.

LESSONS OF DEDICATION FESTIVALS.

By the Rev. F. F. KELLY, LL.M., Vicar of Camberwell.

Sermon Preached at the "Children's Service" at St. Giles', Camberwell.

"And it was at Jerusalem the Feast of the Dedication, and it was winter."—St. John x. 22.

OUR blessed Lord observed very strictly the feasts of the Church of God. It was in Jerusalem that these were so solemnly kept, and we read over and over again of His going up there to keep the feasts in their turn. The feast of the Dedication of the Temple at Jerusalem had been very carefully kept year by year by all pious Jews ever since it had been purified and re-dedicated. It had been damaged by the wilful wickedness of a heathen conqueror, and the anniversary of its having been re-consecrated to the service of God alone was ever afterwards solemnly kept year by year. Six-and-thirty years ago this, our Church of St. Giles, was re-dedicated as God's House of Prayer for His family in this parish. It had been burnt down, and then it was re-built in such a manner that of it men could quote the old words of God's Holy Book, "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former." We shall be wise, therefore, if we keep the festival of that re-dedication. But why? For two reasons. First, it will teach us to thank God for this and all His gifts of grace, and besides this it will bid us think from time to time solemnly of how we use them all, and specially those which cluster round the gift of this beautiful House of Prayer. Our church is the church of St. Giles. Why is it so called? I daresay you have noticed that all our churches have what we call a name. Sometimes it is St. George's—sometimes St. Jude's or St. Andrew's, St. John's or St. Matthew's, for example. Each church is dedicated to the glory of Almighty God in memory of a certain holy person, who is therefore specially called a saint. In each case those who worship there have thus one special example before them. That saint lived in God's faith and fear: he was saved through the sacrifice of the Lord Christ; he lived in Christ and died in Him; his memory is blessed. We may live as he did. His Lord and Saviour is our Lord and Saviour. We were once made saints in Holy Baptism, as was he. If we follow the Lord Christ as he did, though we may be very little people before the world, or even before the Church, our names once written in the Book of Life shall never lose their place there. *We*, then, thank God for St. Giles and his memory. Do you know who St. Giles was? I will tell you. He was a good man, who spent the greater part of a long life very quietly in the service of God. I daresay the men of his time laughed at him, for he lived all by himself in very rough times, when fighting men were of more account in the world than quiet and peaceable ones. He lived in a cave in a forest, and men then knew little of his life and prayers. One day, Childebert, King of the Franks, hunting near the cave, drove a wounded doe into it to take shelter with the gray-haired old man. He protected the frightened beast, and the warrior king, touched by the sight, made a friend of Giles the hermit. At the king's request, though no longer a young man, he became a teacher of gentleness and charity to others; and so widely did the fame of his piety spread, that Charles Martel, the hero of many battles, became anxious to see him, and by him that rough soldier-king was so impressed that he afterwards gave him much assistance in the exercise of his holy office. Little more is known about St. Giles for certain, except that he was far and widely known as a godly man who founded, or induced others to found, many noble and pious institutions. Little did he expect to be able to do such things before God's Providence brought his gentle character to a king's notice. Little did his lot in life through so many years of his life seem to give any opportunity for true greatness. Yet he was truly great all the while, and at last was given to do great things for God, because he was simple and gentle and steadfast and true to the Faith in which he had been brought up. A very good lesson for every member of the Body of Christ! A lesson which you children of the Church may well take to heart! You may think you are little—little-known, little-gifted, little-esteemed. Ah! but what does it "matter if, as God sees you, you are good? Then depend upon it, He will find you opportunities to serve Him if you desire to do so in your heart, and watch how you may show to Him—not to men—how truly you love Him. You must not think that God's service is only for wise people, for great people, for grown-up people. It is for all. And did not our blessed Lord say that those who would serve Him truly must do so in a *childlike* spirit? There is a story of early Church days which explains what is meant by serving God heartily and so really—a story the meaning of which you will easily understand when I tell it to you. Justinian, the great Roman Emperor, determined to build a church for God. He meant it to be very beautiful; and he declared that none but himself should have any hand in it whatever. No expense therefore was spared in the building. Slowly the walls rose from their foundations. Much care was bestowed upon every detail connected with it. It was grand and very beautiful, when the Emperor was told that it was finished. He then gave orders that upon one of the walls there should be engraved on a white marble tablet these words:—"Justinian, the Emperor, gave this Church to God." When the morning came for its consecration Justinian, swelling with pride, and perfectly satisfied with himself because his

commands had been so well carried out, entered the building; but on looking up he read these words, "Ufrania the widow gave this Church to God." Angrily he called for the architect, and demanded why he had altered the inscription. The man answered that he had ordered the words to be engraven as the Emperor had said. Neither he nor anyone else could explain what had happened. "Bring Ufrania the widow before me," cried the Emperor. But this seemed a difficult order to carry out; for no one present knew who she was. At last, after many enquiries, a poor widow of the name was found who lived not far from the newly-built church. Trembling with fear the old woman stood before the great Emperor. "What have *you* done," said he, "towards the building of this church?" She had done nothing—and so she persisted in saying. But being pressed very particularly, she added, "When I saw the poor oxen panting up the hill, struggling under their burdens which the huge blocks of marble made for them, I did but tear out from my bed a few straws, and give them these to eat." And then it struck the proud Emperor that, in God's Providence, the lesson that he needed had thus been taught to him. He had, after all, given nothing but proud thoughts, and costly marbles and so forth, which were nothing to Him; and this poor woman, giving what she did heartily, had given a real gift to God. And so you, little though you are in man's sight, if you do any gentle, kind, and good action, however slight, because your faith urges you, and you wish to please God by so doing, He will accept your gift. He used the life of one who had grown old as a hermit in the forest to teach kings of that Wisdom which is above all earthly riches and honour and power; and He will nerve your young hearts, if you will use the grace He gives, and make you blessed in His Church. Don't ever again say that you are too little, too weak, too unknown to be of use for your dear Lord. Did you never hear that He said, "a cup of cold water given in His name should never lose its reward?" Did you never hear the story of the great general who, lying mortally wounded when some water was brought to him on the battle field, would not drink it till a private soldier, who seemed to need water still more than he did himself, was first given a draught to quench his feverish thirst? Ah! these are the things that prove men to be Christians indeed. If we could do such things they would be of more value in God's sight than many deeds which men call noble and great. Do you remember what things it was for which our blessed Lord praised men and women? A poor widow giving two mites to God's treasury! A broken-hearted sinner pouring ointment on to the tired and dusty feet of Him whom she wished to soothe and be kind to! Well, but these little acts told of hearts that loved, of characters that thought first of what their religion taught them about God's commands, and last of all of self and self-pleasing. Can you live as truly God's children? Does St. Giles' example help you to be content, to be unknown in the world—little thought of even in your own homes—and yet to be ready when God shall call you to do something for Him, to change your life, and everything about you, for His sake? If so, we may indeed say, "God bless you, children of the Church!" as you keep this festival to-day. For God will bless all such His children, and make them happy, too, as He leads them on from grace to grace. Be afraid of this only, lest you should forget how God sees all you do, as He reads through and through all your thoughts. Don't be afraid of trying to do something for His sake. It may be little, indeed, you can do at present. But as you grow older He will enable you to do more; and the stepping-stones to that higher service are these "little works of love and praise for Jesus' sake" which He now day by day puts so plainly within your reach. Serve him heartily in the way you can. Such service in His Church will never be lost to yourselves, or to others.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1881.

CLERICAL STUDY.

WE propose in this article to give a few hints to the clergy of junior standing on the subject of reading—not the art of public reading, but the subject of professional study. It is well-nigh impossible to lay down any general rule that will meet all cases, because men's tastes, capabilities, and acquirements are so varied; but since "reading maketh a full man," and every well-instructed scribe is like "a householder, who brings out of his treasure things new and old," we think that every clergyman, for the benefit of his people and of himself, should always be more or less of a student. The courses of theological study, in which the clergy have been examined at

the Universities, and by the Bishops from whom they received Ordination, will form valuable outlines to be filled in later on—*e.g.*, in his College days a clergyman read a certain amount of Hebrew, of Greek Testament, Church History, works on the Articles and Liturgy, Christian Evidences, &c., &c. Naturally he had a taste for some of these branches of theology more than others; and, without quite neglecting the rest, he may take up his favourite subjects after Ordination and work them up more widely and thoroughly. It is better that he should do so, for energies concentrated on a favourite task will tell much more than if distributed equally over a number for which there is no special aptitude. It is better to know a few subjects well than a much larger number very imperfectly. If a man's forte, therefore, is Hebrew, Greek, Church History, Liturgy, or Dogmatic Theology, let him make *it*, whichever it may be, the backbone of his studies, and it will give steadiness and system to them. One need not necessarily be "a man of one book," but it is a good motto so far as it goes. Take, for instance, such a book as "Butler's Analogy;" it will require patient and persistent study to master it; but to be a man of that one book, as representing its own branch of theological study, the evidential or apologetic, is an accomplishment of which any clergyman may well be proud. The same is true of other standard works in other departments of theology—*e.g.*, of "Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity," of "Bingham's Antiquities," of "Neander's Church History," "Alford's Greek Testament." While, therefore, it should be the *ergon* of every clergyman to read up the department of theology for which he has most taste and capacity, he should, as a *parergon*, acquire a general knowledge of the literature of his profession. Opportunities for study, as well as taste and capacity for it, also vary greatly. Should a young clergyman immediately after his Ordination be placed in a large town parish with numerous services, sick calls, funerals, &c., to attend, it is well-nigh impossible for him to find much time for study; and what time he has to spare for it must be also a good deal devoted to study in connection with the preparation of sermons. For this reason we think it better for a young clergyman that he should not have a very large amount of parochial work put upon him at the very outset of his career. It is better he should begin in a quieter and smaller sphere, where he will have sufficient time to lay down a good solid foundation of reading, and acquire the habit of studying. Dean Hook, whose cares and duties as a parish priest were so multitudinous, said he always considered it was a great advantage to him to have begun his clerical work in a parish which afforded him opportunities for study.

WHAT BISHOP BERKELEY DID FOR CLOYNE.

All that Berkeley did for Cloyne the world will never know. None of his contemporaries wrote his life, and the remembrance of the virtues of a Protestant Bishop was not likely to be long preserved among the ignorant Roman Catholics of the town and neighbourhood. His works, and such of his letters as remain, are almost our only authorities; they go but little way towards satisfying our curiosity, but they are quite sufficient to show how completely his heart was set upon helping and improving those among whom he lived. By special Court influence George Berkeley was made Bishop of Cloyne in January, 1734, and before the end of the summer he had already settled in the home which for eighteen years he scarcely ever left. From the first he was completely devoted to the interests of his diocese. It was an age in which "nothing was considered but with a political view," yet only once was the Bishop's eloquence heard in the Irish Parliament. More than this, when influential friends on every side urged him to apply for the Primacy, and promised him success, his answer was, "I am so far from soliciting that I do not even wish for it, I do not think myself the fittest man for that high post." Most remarkable of all, when he was actually offered the rich bishopric of Clogher, which would have doubled his income, he refused it, saying he was resolved never to change his See, because he had very early in life got the world under his feet, and he hoped to trample upon it to his latest moments. All his thoughts centred in his studies and his people. He studied because he felt that his philosophy was a powerful weapon against the freethinkers of the time; he loved his people because, in the widest sense, he believed that he was appointed to be their Father in God. It was indeed a happy day for Cloyne that brought George Berkeley to her palace. Rich with the lore of many books and many lands, gifted with an irresistible charm of manner, he naturally became a leader in such society as the neighbourhood afforded. He used his influence for the purpose of instilling a love of culture into his friends, striving to induce them to give up the idle, not to say ignorant habits of the time, by holding out the inducements of the fine arts, and the advantages of a superior education. Conscious of the force of example, he educated his sons and daughters with the greatest care, and spared no trouble or expense in making music and painting appear to the best advantage at the palace. Pictures by the best masters adorned the walls; musical instruments of surpassing excellence were collected from various parts of Europe; painting classes and societies were formed in the neighbourhood, and every week concerts were given at Cloyne. There is a remarkable tribute to the success of these efforts in Smith's History of Cork, where he says: "His present lordship has successfully transplanted the polite arts to this northern climate. Painting and music are no longer strangers in Ireland, nor confined to Italy."

We must not, however, imagine that Berkeley's cultivated tastes for a moment obscured the more essential duties of a Christian Bishop to his people. No one could more completely have thrown himself into their feelings than he, and his advice and ready help were at the disposal of all who stood in need of them. We can fancy the Bishop, with his Cloyne-made wig, and clothes constructed by the nearest

tailor, as he moves through the streets. Everyone has a welcome for him, for he has shown his love for them in a thousand ways. The men consult him about their business ; the women bring their trouble to him, particularly their illnesses ; for he has wrought many cures with his wonderful remedy, "tar water," and he is doctor to all the country round. There is not a child he does not know, for he has started a spinning-school, to give them suitable employment, and he takes the greatest trouble to induce them all to attend. Even the vagrant beggars have special cause to bless him, when they hear of the comfortable house he has built for their accommodation. To instil habits of thrift and industry, and to win over the people by the force of his affection for them, were the principles which guided the Bishop's every-day life. Let us in conclusion glance at some of the exertions and sacrifices which these principles led him to make, whenever the troubles of the times bore heavily upon the neighbourhood of Cloyne. Witness him, for instance, when the country was infested with fierce bands of robbers, himself organising a troop of horse to resist them. Witness him again denying himself the ordinary comforts of life that he might have the more to give away ; by means of careful frugality he was able all through the famine winter of 1740-41 to give freely from his kitchen, to distribute £20 every Monday morning, and to keep one hundred workmen constantly employed. Once more witness him, during the whole of the epidemic fever, which succeeded the famine, going in and out among the people, ministering to their wants, and tending them with his own hands. Thus honourably, amid noble thoughts and noble deeds, passed the eighteen years of Berkeley's episcopate ; all too many of the details of his goodness are wanting, but more than enough remain to enable us to answer fearlessly to all who ask what Berkeley did for Cloyne—"He shed around it the lustre of a great name, and the brighter lustre of a spotless and holy life."

H. KINGSMILL MOORE,
Hon. Sec. to Berkeley Memorial Fund.

ANNUAL FESTIVAL OF THE CHURCH SUNDAY SCHOOL CHOIR, IN CONNEXION WITH THE SUNDAY SCHOOL INSTITUTE.

FÊTE AT THE CRYSTAL PALACE, MONDAY, MAY 16.

(Continued from page 248.)

We will mention several of the Secular pieces sung at the above Festival. By way of introduction we quote from the "Advertisement" or notice printed in the "Member's Copy" of the Festival Book :—"The chief object is to promote the knowledge of vocal music and especially of sacred music and Psalmody, in Church Sunday Schools. Selections of music, sacred and secular, will be prepared for performance at Annual Festivals, to be held at the Crystal Palace or other suitable places, and will serve for repetition, in whole or in part, at local gatherings. Every encouragement will be given for the formation of singing classes in connexion with the separate schools."

Taken as an illustration of the result of this systematical organization of the material available for such monster demonstrations as that of the 16th inst., we should without hesitation pronounce the festival itself the best proof of the committee having gone the right way to work to secure their aim, as above given. If five thousand five hundred voices can be trained by such means as are at the disposal of the committee to sing a programme of twenty-two pieces of varied difficulty, with such excellent precision in such correct time and tune as both divisions of the programme were rendered, and with such taste, feeling, and expression, as many of the pieces in the secular division were sung, it is clear that the committee have succeeded in their efforts "to promote the knowledge of vocal music," and that in order to do so they must already have "given every encouragement for the formation of singing classes in connexion with the separate schools."—*Quod erit faciendum.*

The demonstration of their success is involved in the fact of the absence of any hitch in the arrangement and execution of the demonstration itself.

Orpheus himself would have been gratified, had he been invited. By Orpheus, on this occasion, we mean Mr. August Manns, the Conductor of the Crystal Palace Orchestral Band. During the performance of the introduction to the third act of Wagner's "Lohengrin" a musical tyro belonging to the Sunday School Choir, advancing up the stairs behind the conductor begged his permission to take up a position amongst the instrumentalists, as being also himself a musician. We think we observed the conductor's batôn descend more vigorously as he courteously shook a "No !" at the audacious intruder. Three hours later the young vocalist was singing Mason's "Mountain Boy's Song" lustily, having climbed *his* "mountain" by the *rear* at last. Lahee's part song to Tennyson's "New Year" went beautifully, all the more so as from its light and tripping movement it came as a relief after some of the heavier "anthems" and movements not so well adapted to undeveloped voices. It is needless to say it was immediately encored. In "May-Day" the final word in the line, "Merry month of May," coming on the note F, gave the girls a chance which they took care not to lose. On some of the higher notes throughout the concert the sweetest effect was often produced in this way. Especially was this the case in the duett "Lilly Bells and Roses," where a "run" on F G and A gave the first sopranos a glorious opportunity.

The part song, "Bells Ringing," was deservedly encored, and so also was the "Mountain Boy's Song," when the echo seemed to come, as it actually did, from the vault above. We have only room to mention three other pieces, favourites with us, to which the choir did justice, to say the least that can be said.

(1) Braham's part song, "All's Well," very much in the style of some of Bishop's glees.

(2) Old Irish melody, "The Harp that Once," a somewhat pathetic piece ; and (3) "Footsteps on the Stairs," sung very tenderly, and one which evidently moved the singers as much as it melted the audience.

The part song by Spark, "Cheer, Cheer, for all the Sons of Toil," was the greatest possible contrast to the style of "Footsteps ;" and when we say that neither could have been rendered better we have said all that it is possible to say—Orpheus could not have found fault.

CORRESPONDENCE.

REASONS FOR NOT ENCOURAGING DOUBTS ABOUT CHRISTIANITY.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I think that much of the misunderstanding between "R. G." and myself arises from his ambiguous use of the word authority. In his first letter he employs the word as signifying the general consent of mankind; in his last letter he employs it as a substitute for the word testimony. The argument he put forward in proof of the truth of Christianity was that it had been believed by our forefathers, who must have had strong reasons for their belief, and that we should be influenced by their *authority*. Here the word authority is used in the sense of consent; the proof adduced is from the former general consent of our forefathers to the truth of Christianity. My reply was that this authority or consent was a legitimate argument wherever the belief is not disputed, but that whenever that belief is called in question, by any considerable number of people, it ceases to be a legitimate argument. We must in that case, if we would support the contested opinion, fall back upon the reasons on which that consent had originally been based, and the opinion must stand or fall according to the inherent strength or weakness of those reasons. "R. G." says he does not understand the example I chose; I will try another. That the world is flat, not round, was an idea which for long received the general consent of mankind. In course of time, however, men arose who called in question the truth of this opinion, and when they did so, to appeal against them to the authority of their forefathers, to the former general consent of mankind, was useless. We now believe in the existence of Julius Cæsar. The consent of mankind is given to this belief. If, however, a considerable number of men were to come forward and say we have very strong reasons for doubting that he ever really existed, here again the argument from the former consent of mankind from authority *in this sense of the word*, would be useless, and recourse must be had to the evidence from which that consent had been obtained. The evidence to be examined in this case would be derived from *testimony*, and it is in this sense that "R. G." employs the word authority when he asks, "Upon what grounds independent of authority can we believe that Julius Cæsar ever existed?"

Now the situation is exactly the same with regard to Christianity. The general consent of mankind is not now given to it, and therefore the proof from authority (taking authority as meaning the former general consent of mankind, being the sense in which it was originally employed by "R. G.") is valueless. We must now fall back upon the re-examination of the evidence on which that former consent was given. If that evidence be found strong enough to bear the test, Christianity will stand; if it does not, Christianity will fall. This is what I mean when I say that Christianity, or any doctrine of Christianity, if true, must maintain its own by virtue of its inherent strength, without leaning upon any props of *authority*. I do not mean to deny that much of the evidence for Christianity does rest upon *testimony*.

AN IRISH CORRESPONDENT.

THE REVISED VERSION.

SIR,—We are much indebted to you for providing such admirable criticism of the above as the three judicial, scholarly, and logical notices by Archdeacon Reichel. His commendation is both well deserved and well illustrated by crucial passages. He finds fault with the taste of the Revisers and their rendering into English of the Greek article and tenses. On the two latter points I am not a competent enough scholar to express an opinion, and on the former *de gustibus non est disputandum*. But he also puts his finger on a glaring violation of the important rule laid down by the Revisers themselves, to render the same Greek word by the same English word if it be repeated in the same passage, viz. in 2 Cor. xii. 9, where δύναμις is rendered by power and strength as in the A. V., but, as it seems, injudiciously transposed thus, "My *power* is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly will I therefore rather glory in my weakness, that the *strength* of Christ may rest upon me." I have tried in vain to surmise the reason for this. Dr. Roberts's "Companion to the Revised Version" is silent on the point, and it does not agree with the rendering of the same word in a similar image in St. Luke i. 35: "The *power* of the Most High shall overshadow thee." If by power of Christ is meant His ability to work miracles, it is misleading to have it translated by *strength*. It would be very desirable if you, Sir, or some of the learned Revisers, would explain the deviation; for doubtless there are reasons for this departure from the A. V.

MEDICUS.

Reviews and Notices.

"THRIFT LESSONS." By the Rev. John J. Walters, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1881. Pp. 240. 3s. 6d.

This is a valuable little work, containing excellent instruction on various subjects. It is written in the form of letters. Those on "Laws of Health" are especially useful, and written in an interesting and simple style, suitable for all classes of readers. The advice given is sound and sensible. The letters on "Drink," "Clothing," &c., are much to be commended. Letter 8, on "The Dwelling," is principally for the working classes, and if the directions it contains were carried out, the health and comfort of their families would be greatly enhanced. The two letters on the up-bringing of children are very valuable, particularly the second, which treats of the religious education of the young. The letter on the Lord's Day, "Sunday Thrift," cannot be too strongly commended. There are several good recipes for general cookery, and cookery for the sick; also directions for the nursing of the sick. It is to be hoped that this useful and interesting little publication will be appreciated as it deserves, and have a large circulation.

THE CREED OF SCIENCE: RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL. By William Graham, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul, and Co. 1881. Pp. xxxii., 412.

This is in many respects a noteworthy book. It is such a production as might be expected from an earnest and thoughtful writer, possessed of every qualification, *except one*, for the satisfactory treatment

of his subject. Given a general acquaintance with modern science and philosophy, a warm sympathy with mankind in their aspirations and sorrows, a real desire to get at the truth of their relations and destinies, and a considerable breadth of critical discernment; but let these qualifications be accompanied by such an absolute incapacity for appreciating spiritual experience, as to allow of the inner life and deepest emotions of God's saints being deliberately identified with the impressions made by nature on the artistic faculty, and their communion with the living God reduced to a poetic sympathy with "the visible, bountiful, beautiful, mysterious Cosmos:" let these, we say, be the mental conditions governing an enquiry into the creed which science will permit us to hold, and the result that might be anticipated is exactly what is placed before us in this volume. With the object of the writer we can readily sympathise. Bare, gross materialism is repugnant alike to his intellect and his heart; he recoils with invincible loathing from the doctrine that matter is the last and deepest thing in the universe, and that the entire evolution of existence is due to physical necessity and blind chance. Yet he sees that to this terrible conclusion, science, in the hands of its most outspoken leaders, appears to be slowly but surely guiding human thought: and to science he feels himself bound to be loyal. In this dilemma a possible way of escape presents itself to his mind, and he sets himself to examine it. To deny the validity of the well-established and generally accepted results of science is impossible for him; but is there not a gap of unverified speculation between the most advanced of these and the full-blown materialistic hypothesis? Is there not still room for a belief in Something behind matter, and deeper than matter,—Something which excludes chance by eternal purpose? It is to find an answer to this question that he passes the creed of science under review.

It scarcely needs to be remarked that there is not in reality any definite body of articles of belief which can strictly be called "The Creed of Science." But what is meant by this loose phrase is explained in the following extract from the preface:—"In the absence of any single and universally acknowledged authority on all articles of faith and doctrine, I have taken the *consensus* of scientific opinion amongst the few highest authorities on each particular article, and I have treated this as the orthodox teaching of science—as what would have been the decision had all such authorities met together in council, to fix the faith." If it seems bold for one who is not a specialist in science to criticise the conclusions of these masters of science in their respective domains, and to do so in the very name of science itself, a justification is founded on the distinction "between scientific faith, and scientific fact, between a fully verified law, and a supposed inference hazarded from it without being contained under it, between a well-established theory and a hypothesis only probable, perhaps only possible." And no one will quarrel with the position taken up by our author as the basis of his work, when he declares it to be "our right and our duty to challenge the conclusions of science, or rather of the current philosophies which profess to speak in her name, and with her credit, when they affect to be authoritative and final deliverances on philosophic or religious questions of supreme import."

The conclusions at which our author arrives are briefly these. The idea of Creation must be given up, as absolutely unthinkable; matter and force must be eternal. With Creation human freewill must also disappear, because it "would make the *ego* a true creator;" all miracles also, as being in fact special instances of creation. "Science," it is asserted, "cannot without self-destruction allow either the miracle in general, or the special one of creation *ex nihilo*; and least of all can she allow, that both take place within the theatre of man's breast in the production of something from nothing, as in the supposed exercise of a free uncaused will." Again, the doctrine of a difference between the human and the animal natures must be abandoned. "Man is an animal, as science teaches, and nothing more; and an animal he remains till the latest day of his earthly sojourn. He is an animal all too surely, and descended from a long line of animal ancestors, stretching backwards to the very dawn of life." "That man is an animal, is the great and special discovery of natural science in our generation. He is only an animal, though the highest of the animals, who has been raised to his pre-eminence, partly by the long-continued favour of fortune, partly by his own efforts, but not by any means by special creation or special favour shown him after his supposed creation." Once more the conception of a conscious, personal God, "a separate Being and Personality" in relation with us, must be renounced as unscientific and self-contradictory. "I am quite prepared to give up the old anthropomorphic Creator. . . . I am even ready, on the strength of the united demand of modern philosophy and thought, ... to surrender the human attributes of personality and consciousness in the Deity; and all the more readily as we are assured by philosophy, that these attributes, which we find we can never, by the utmost effort of thought, connect in any way with the notion of God, are in clear contradiction to the notion of an Absolute Being, which, as such, cannot be subject to the limitations which consciousness implies."

Here then we seem to have advanced a long way in the direction of atheistic materialism; and what we have now to observe, is the struggle of our author to stop short of the goal, and save at least something from the devouring fire of his science. To effect his purpose he is compelled to invoke "the universal human instincts," of which as *data* in its problems science is not accustomed to take much account; and by their aid he endeavours (1) to save man from feeling himself to be "the slave of any fatalistic necessity;" (2) to permit him to indulge the hope of some kind of future existence; (3) to enable him still to believe in Something behind nature which he may call God. Taking the last point first, his line is this. We cannot without violence to reason bring ourselves to think that the universe is only phenomenal; both we ourselves, and what we perceive must be real. Neither can we rest in the belief that the development of the mighty Cosmos has been purposeless. The evolution theory, true in itself, is not the whole truth; it is not a complete philosophy of existence, for neither nature nor man can be explained by supposing them to be the product of mere physical energies and accidental variations. Of both we are constrained to think that the growth and course must have been guided "from the Unknown, from the Purpose of the universe, that thus means and wishes to declare and develop itself—from God and not from Chance." Hence we are led to believe that behind matter and force there must be Something, an ultimate Principle

or Reality, unknowable except that it manifests purpose, and that its purpose is good. This is the real Deity, not personal nor conscious, nor separable from the totality of Being ; and which may be practically defined as "the entire visible universe, with its immanent energy and final unresolvable mystery." Or, if we do not like to bind together Nature and its underlying mystery in a single word, then we may define God as "the purpose within, and the mystery at the bottom, of Nature." Of course this is a form of Pantheism, and so our author admits ; but he looks forward to its acceptance by Theology after a time, and thinks that it will offer an "effectual check to the new and all-menacing materialism."

It is not so clear how any kind of freedom is saved for man. If under the stimulus of merely physical energies, although directed by unconscious purpose, matter began to live, and man is nothing but one of the forms of living matter, one does not readily see how he can be free to direct his actions, any more than other forms of matter are free—chemical mixtures, for instance, or poisons, or machines. To deny human freewill on scientific grounds, and then to claim for man a power of self-direction on the ground of his conscious experience, seems to be inconsistent. However, this is our author's conclusion : "The *Man* has, if his *Will* has not, a certain directive power. He can to a large extent control his conduct ; he has an undoubted, and a great capacity of working towards distant aims, which he strongly desires to reach, and of foreseeing and directing the intermediate steps towards those ends."

The chapters which endeavour to justify against Science the hope of a future existence are interesting, and we may add curious. Our present consciousness is a fact, and yet an insoluble mystery ; "and since I am a conscious individual now, without my knowing how I am so or how I became so, why may not the like have place once again ? or indeed more than once ?" Or there may be something better, greater, grander than consciousness ; and not one such state only but many, into one of which we may one day enter, after we quit this present state. Memory, indeed, we cannot hope to carry with us ; but "this at least appears certain, we shall never escape out of the circle of existence into annihilation." It is not surprising that our author, after labouring to sustain an immortality of this kind against the annihilation of the materialists, should imagine an objector replying that "the doctrine is as little palatable as consoling"!

In conclusion we would say that the book is a good illustration of the futility of attempting to solve the great problems of human nature and its destiny by means of Science alone. Ignoring, as the author does, the inward witness of man's spirit to God as manifested in the wide sphere of religious experience, and neglecting the light thrown on the mystery of life and death by the mighty facts of the Hebraic and Christian developments, he is as imperfectly equipped for his task as an astronomer would be for his, if he refused the aid of all the instruments of research, and undertook to master the science of the skies by the unassisted power of the naked eye.

On Thursday, the 30th ult., a conference was held at King's College, London, under the presidency of the Chaplain, at which a paper, dealing with the subject, "How to obtain and retain an influence over men," was read by the Rev. G. Eden Peake, vicar of St. Margaret's, Rochester. There was a good attendance of past and present theological students, and an interesting discussion followed the reading of the paper. The conference, which was the fifth of a series, set on foot by the Chaplain in connection with his lectures on Pastoral Duties, was closed with a short evening service.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Chapman, Rev. Theodore Charles, chaplain of Christ Church, Laxey, Isle of Man.
Clarke, Rev. Peter Watkin, incumbent of St. Oswald, Hebburn.
Disbrowe, Rev. Canon, rector of Benington, near Boston ; rural dean.
Dudley. Rev. Henry Thornton, curate of Aldridge ; vicar of Bradwell, Derbyshire.
Dyce, Rev. A. F., chaplain of Toulon ; summer chaplain at St. Martin-Lantosque, Nice, Alpes Maritimes.
Foster, Rev. John Priestley, vicar of Mirfield ; vicar of Elmore.
Greenstreet, Rev. E. F., assistant-curate of Kilndown ; minor canon in Rochester Cathedral.
Guest, Rev. W. G., rector of All Saints', York ; rector of Lymm, Cheshire.
Heath, Rev. Frank, vicar of Pitstone, Bucks.
Iredell, Rev. Henry Shrubb, minister of St. Barnabas, Tunbridge Wells.
Jackson, Rev. Edmund, jun., rector of Gillmorton, Leicestershire.
Johnson, Rev. Frederick, senior curate of Ewell ; surrogate.
Leakey, Rev. Peter Nettleton, rector of Blaby, Leicestershire.
Liddell, Rev. Edward Thomas, rector of Jarrow-on-Tyne ; honorary canon in Durham Cathedral.
Macnaught, Rev. John, perpetual curate of St. Mary, North-end, Fulham.
Mitchell, Rev. R. A., vicar of Pemberton, Wigan.
Norton, Rev. Thomas, curate ; rector of Witchling, near Sittingbourne.
Sanderson, Rev. James, curate of East Dereham ; assistant-curate of Ewell.
Vardon, Rev. Stanley Arthur, vicar of All Saints', Langdon-green, Tunbridge Wells ; rector of Speldhurst.
Watts, Rev. Robert Rowley, vicar of Stower Payne, Dorset ; rural dean of Pimperne (first portion).
Whigham, Rev. Laurence R., vicar of Hordle, Hants ; vicar of Polesworth, Warwickshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Crawley, Rev. Henry Owen, M.A., of Semington, Trowbridge, at Cheltenham, on the 3rd inst., aged 58.
Fellowes, Rev. Thomas Lyon, vicar of Honingham and East Tuddenham, Norfolk, and hon. canon of Norwich Cathedral, at the Vicarage, Honingham, on the 24th ult., aged 64.
Hart, Rev. Richard, for thirty-nine years vicar of Catton, near Norwich, at Catton, on the 23rd ult., aged 76.
Harris, Rev. Joseph Hemington, D.D., for thirty-one years vicar of the united parishes of Tormohun and Cockington, at Sorel, Torquay, on the 25th ult., aged 80.
Haydon, Rev. William, vicar of Bapchild, on the 22nd ult., aged 57.
Maurice, Rev. Thomas, M.A., for forty-one years rector of Harnhill, at Harnhill Rectory, on the 26th ult., aged 75.
McCall, Rev. William, M.A., vicar of St. George's, Tufnell-park, at St. Helen's Park-crescent, Southsea, on the 30th ult., aged 60.
Murray, Rev. G. Hope, M.A., of Caius College, Cambridge, at Gipsy-hill, Norwood, on the 22nd ult., aged 38.
Perry, Rev. S. G. F., for thirty-one years vicar of Tottington, author of "Second Synod of Ephesus with Syriac Translation," at Tottington Vicarage, Lancashire, on the 21st ult., aged 63.
Salter, Rev. Frederick, at Hethe Rectory, Bicester, on the 30th ult.
Topham, Rev. John, M.A., rector of the parish of St. Andrew, Droitwich, for fifty-four years, and formerly head master of the Grammar-school of King Edward VI., Bromsgrove, on the 24th ult., aged 86.
Upcher, Rev. Hugh Knyvet, R.N., chaplain H.M.S. *Invincible*, fourth son of the Rev. A. Upcher, of Kirby Cane Rectory, Norfolk, at Malta, of typhoid fever, on the 12th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

PRAYER AND ITS OBJECT.

By the Rev. W. H. BARLOW, B.D.,
Principal of the Church Missionary College, Islington.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday Afternoon, June 19th, 1881.

"If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?"—St. Luke xi. 13.

THE words just read, important as they are in themselves, seem much more so when regarded as the conclusion of a section of our Lord's teaching. The section I refer to is comprised in the first thirteen verses of this chapter, wherein are contained (1) the words of prayer taught by Christ Himself to His disciples; (2) a parable to illustrate the spirit in which this and all supplication should be addressed to God; (3) a threefold command, enforced by an appeal to the ordinary experience of human life; and (4) a promise of the crowning gift of the Holy Spirit to those who should thus employ aright the privilege of prayer. In dwelling at the outset on the verses that precede my text, I do so of set purpose, so as to throw into the strongest possible light the blessing which is offered to those that ask for it, in the name of Christ.

And I., first, as to the occasion—"It came to pass that as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." This must, surely, though we have no intimation of the fact, have been a source of gladness to our Lord. We read frequently of His sadness, of His tears, of His grief at the hardness of the hearts of men—we rarely hear of His joy. True, there is an instance of His joy recorded in x. 21—"In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." If signs of spiritual life and growth caused such satisfaction in the one case, the desire to be taught to pray must surely have evoked similar feelings in the other. Nor is the time past for the like joy to be felt by the Lord, even on His throne of glory in heaven. Whenever a disciple on earth, longing for light and strength, asks Him to be taught how to pray, then does He see afresh of the travail of His soul, and is satisfied. The behaviour of this disciple illustrates, in a remarkable way, a law of the kingdom of grace. He felt a pressing spiritual want. He went to Christ for the supply of that want; he probably had no thought beyond his own immediate needs; but the prayer which he was taught to use was not for his peculiar benefit and guidance alone. It was for the instruction and comfort of all who, to the end of time, should have its words written upon their hearts, and find in them the exponent of their souls' desires. In like manner the members of the Philippian Church, in all sincerity and simplicity of spirit, sent to Rome, by Epaphroditus, a contribution of money for the relief of Paul's bodily necessities. In so doing they were really ministering to Christ, and probably had no thought beyond honouring the Lord in the person of His servant. They received in return a gift, immeasurably better than the one they had sent—the letter of their father in the faith. But, however much of divine counsel they themselves received from the Apostle's words, the benefit was not confined to them. Others, in countless numbers, have derived teaching and consolation from the blessed pages of the Epistle to the Philippians. Truly, in the economy of the kingdom of Christ, no man liveth, or worketh, or giveth, or prayeth, or dieth, for himself.

But to return. I need not dwell on the details of the prayer given to the enquiring disciple, beyond noting its sevenfold division, and the order and proportion of its petitions. God's glory rightly occupies the foremost place; secondly, our temporal wants may lawfully be stated before God; but, thirdly, our spiritual needs are more diversified and urgent than our temporal. It would be well for all forms of devotion, penned by the piety of the Church on earth, to be moulded on the pattern of this prayer Divine.

II. We come now to the parable which was uttered to describe the spirit in which all prayer should be offered before the throne of God. In one word, Importunity, that spirit may be summed up. And it is enforced by a story as simple as it is beautiful. An Eastern traveller arrives, late at night, at the house of a friend. The host, whilst welcoming the wayfarer, has no food to set before him. But the claims of hospitality were sacred, and must be discharged. He goes, therefore, to the house of a neighbour, to borrow food. The one on whom he thus calls has withdrawn to rest. Himself, and his family, and household have all retired. He does not grudge the gift; but he does shrink from the trouble of rising to supply what is asked. But the one who stands without has a good cause in hand—the cause of another, whose distress must be relieved. So, without any compunction or feeling of shame, he continues to knock until the one from within, worn out by his importunity, rises and gives him—not the three loaves

for which he modestly asked, but as many as he needeth. Here, in the earthly story, man's indolence and indifference are overcome by the vehemence of another's desire, by the strength of another's will. Are we then, from this parable, or from the parallel one of the unjust judge, to argue that God (whilst always able) may be unwilling, from time to time, to supply our needs, and that His unwillingness must be overborne by our superior strength of earnestness and determination of character? Such language would cross some of the plainest teachings of the Bible. God is not unwilling to hear, or to answer, or to enrich His servants. But He nowhere binds Himself to do this in the way, or at the time, that His servants may deem best. What He does undertake to do is to answer in the right way and at the right time. And in delaying for a season to reply to our petitions, He would shew us the importance of a waiting, trusting spirit; He would teach us that He can fulfil Himself in many ways; and He would have us remember that He is the maker, no less than the hearer, of prayer. How then could He be indifferent to the entreaties which are breathed heavenwards by the action of His own power in the hearts of His servants?

III. In the next place, we observe a threefold command to prayer, "Ask, seek, and knock." Was it intended, we may reverently ask, that one and the same idea should be developed in these words, so that the threefold form of them simply implies vigour and earnestness in the direction given? This opinion is held by some. Yet, surely, that interpretation is sounder which recognises in each word a special meaning, marking it off from either one of the remaining two. For example: (i.) what was intended by the command to ask? Surely this, that he who pleads should state his case with all minuteness of detail, and faithfulness alike to God and to himself. Much light seems thrown on the right use of this word by what follows. The example of children towards a wise, loving, earthly parent is cited. How do children, when they have a desire unfulfilled, press it upon a considerate father? Not in vague, general language. Their wants are always very definite to their own minds, and are expressed in precise terms to others. They do not ask for clothing in general, for food in general, for amusements in general; but for this or that definite article of attire, this or that definite portion of food, this or that definite means of amusement.

Nor let it be thought beneath the dignity of a great subject, that a lesson should be taught us by little children. In their place they ought to be heard. They are examples to their elders of the faith which ought to move everyone who seeks God in prayer; of the sense of need, out of which true prayer arises; and of the definiteness in asking which He delights to notice, Who (like as a father pities his children) so pitieth them that fear Him. Of course, in public worship, this definiteness in asking cannot be carried out to so great an extent as in private devotion. There it is, that grace for the day must be asked in plain terms. If perplexity arise as to our path in life, let wisdom be asked. If a danger be feared, let protection be asked. If sickness have invaded the dwelling, let recovery be asked. If a known sin be cherished, let power to crush it be asked. If a work for God, or for others, be before us, let power to perform it be asked. If the Scriptures of Truth be open for our study, let divine illumination be asked. Whatever, in short, be before us or around us, of doing and suffering, let direct, specific, immediate prayer be employed. And this is asking. But, whilst I say this of private prayer, I should remember how very full is the Litany of the Church of England of petitions of the definite kind referred to. There seems hardly a want to which man is subjected, or a sorrow which wrings his heart, the solace for which is not mentioned in that form. But whether the occasion be public or private, the words written or unwritten, true prayer must be real in its sense of need, and definite in regard to what is desired to be obtained.

(ii.) If this is asking, what is seeking? It is the taking of all possible pains to obtain that by care and effort, for which the previous petitions have asked. I say "previous petitions," for the order here is important. God, who is the Author of all blessing, must first be taken into counsel; and then, effort (which He alone can bless) must be put forth. To labour for the attainment of your end, without first laying the case before God, is presumption; to pray, however earnestly, for a spiritual or temporal benefit, and not to follow up these petitions with zealous labour, is mockery. Let the two be combined, and then the true secret of success is hit upon. Moses prayed, on the mountain side, for victory against Amalek, as if prayer were the people's only weapon; Joshua fought in the plain, as if his good sword could win the day. Moses was asking, Joshua seeking. And victory followed. So, after prayer for guidance, pains must be taken to learn God's will. If protection from danger be asked, all lawful means to avoid the danger must be used. If sickness threaten, the skill of the physician and the nurse must be used. If a work for God or man be taken in hand, let it be done with all laborious faithfulness. If the sacred page be open for study, let the best helps that can be obtained be sedulously employed. Previous prayer brightens and sweetens the subsequent labour; even as the subsequent labour is sanctified and made successful by the preceding prayer. The two act and re-act one on the other, in perfect harmony.

(iii.) But what place does knocking occupy in respect to the two first-named? It describes the frame of mind which expects to be heard. Of some prayers it may be said, that the offerer would

be surprised if an answer were returned; of true prayer it should be said, that surprise ought to be felt if an answer (sooner or later, some way or other) were not returned. Again, the ordinary affairs of daily life supply an illustration. An application to a friend, by the knocking at a door, implies an expectation of an answer. Neglect to give such answer would wound and annoy the spirit of the applicant. And shall we treat God worse than we treat our fellowmen? Shall we use earnest entreaties for blessings which He alone can grant, and then (rising from our knees) forget throughout the day the very things for which we have asked? Nay, rather, our posture of mind should be that of men who expect to be heard. If prayer be really speaking to God; if He has all power, wisdom, and love—then to deal with Him in this cold, indifferent spirit, is to fail of the benefits which He is able to impart, and we so sorely need. The church in Jerusalem, as described in the twelfth chapter of the Acts, sets an example of warning on this point. James had been beheaded; Peter was in custody. At the end of the days of unleavened bread, he was to be brought forth for execution. Meantime, unceasing prayer was made by the Church for his release. Yet when the answer came, and he knocked at the door of Mary, the mother of John, Mark and the assembled company were informed (in effect) that their prayers had been answered, the news seemed too good to be true. They had prayed, but they had not fully expected to be heard.

IV. And now we come to the grand conclusion, for which all else has been preparatory:—"If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him." "Ye," to whom the Lord spake then, as He speaks now—are evil. Evil by nature, and evil by habit. In evil you were born, and in evil you have lived. Evil your thoughts, your words, your deeds. Yet is there one redeeming feature in your character: you will deny yourselves for, and give the best you possess to, your offspring. If a starving child asks for bread, you give him not a useless stone: if he desire a fish, you give him not a venomous serpent: if an egg, you give him not a stinging scorpion. If this be true, then pursue the argument. "How much more"—as the heavens are higher than the earth, as God's ways are not our ways, nor His thoughts our thoughts—"how much more shall your Heavenly Father give good gifts (in Matthew's narrative)—the Holy Spirit (in Luke's)—to them that ask Him." The fact that men, evil though they be, have yet this spirit of self-denial for their offspring, is borne witness to in every age and land. In the mining and manufacturing districts of this country, in times of scarcity of employment, when hunger has stared whole families in the face, strong men have been known to rise from their (so-called) breakfast tables, unfed, rather than touch the crust which barely sufficed for the wants of a single child. Tender mothers overtaken in journeying through mountainous districts by a sudden snowstorm, have been known to wrap their infants in the clothing which would not suffice for both. And, when help came, the child has been rescued alive, whilst the mother has perished in the cold. I, myself, laboured for sixteen years in one of the poorest and most neglected parishes of a great city. Amid the poverty, squalor, and degradation of that place, misery and death presented themselves in varied forms. But this one thought was continually brought home to my mind—these very persons (who have passed through such scenes of wretchedness and vice) are often most anxious to spare their children from the same. "Oh! may my child never know," said a poor mother, dying in early womanhood a vagrant's death, in a low lodging-house, deserted by one who ought to have helped her, and cast off by her relations as a disgrace to their name—"may my child never know what I have known." With the damp dews of death on her brow, it was for her child that she seemed almost entirely concerned. "If ye, then, being evil, know" this one lesson, "how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?"

But, now, as to the gift for which the prayer, thus described for us, is to ascend. Is it a trivial, insignificant, transitory gift? No. It is the best of all—that of the Holy Ghost. Think for a moment of His work. It is He who must bring to the heart of man his sense of sin and helplessness. It is He who must teach faith in the person and atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is He who helps our infirmities in prayer. It is He who perfects holiness in the fear of the Lord. It is He who throws light on the pages of God's word. Is a mourner comforted? He does it. Is a backslider reclaimed? He works the restoration. Is a door opened for the preaching of the Gospel? He must open it. Is the Church of Christ preserved, from age to age, from fundamental error? He is the salt that preserves it from corruption. Whatever spiritual work be done, in the present dispensation, between the two advents of the Lord Jesus—there the Holy Spirit must be the active agent. Let us carefully cherish the doctrine of His Deity, and of His personality. He is the Lord, and the Giver of Life. And we can never rightly understand the privileges of the Christian covenant, unless the true place therein of the work of the Holy Ghost be recognised. Now this gracious Being is promised—and this is the point to which all I have said leads up—to those that ask. There is no limitation introduced. The promise is the widest in the whole of Scripture. The gift is offered, not to the contemptu-

ous, the cold, the indifferent—but to those that ask. Not to those who would build an eclectic system of their own choosing, admitting some parts of God's truth, and denying others. Not to those who feel confidence in their own strength and power of turning unto God; but to those who ask. And the one answer to those who complain of their low state of holiness, of their difficulties, trials, vexations, and falls—is this: Whilst God has provided for you this vast and unfailing supply of grace, can you rightly complain, if the one condition which He has imposed be neglected—"Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." May unceasing prayer for this priceless gift be the mark of those whom I have the responsibility of addressing. On the portals of the chapel of Jesus College, Oxford, is the simple but expressive legend, "Ascendat oratio, descendat gratia." Of that motto may Cambridge, may Oxford, may all other seminaries of sound learning and religious education all over the world, never be ashamed. May the college chapel, in these changing days, be more than ever a power in our University life. May the services meet a felt want; may they be attended in a devout spirit. May they become cherished memories to those who go forth, as men, to do the work and fight the battle of life. May those who return, for a brief sojourn, to these favoured spots, find in the chapel service their delight. May that be the first place to be revisited, rather than the athletic arena, the beautiful garden, the splendid library, or the hospitable hall. And may the object for which all prayer shall arise to God be this—the gift of the Holy Spirit.

"HONOUR TO THE KING."

By the Rev. F. R. WYNNE, M.A., Incumbent of St. Matthias's, Dublin.

Sermon Preached in St. Matthias' Church on the Sunday after Ascension, 1881.

"Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."—Exodus iii. 5.

IT has been recorded of a very wise and thoughtful man, that whenever in his travels he came upon a particularly beautiful view, he used to uncover his head. The fair outward scene was to him a token of the presence of the Great Creator, and he humbly did Him homage. Amidst the scanty brushwood of the Syrian wilderness a special manifestation of Him who fills all space was vouchsafed to Moses. There, "where foot of man had ne'er or rarely been," there, among the rugged, lonely hills, where he used to spend the long hours with his sheep—God made Himself known to him—his eyes saw an outward symbol of the Divine Presence, his heart heard the command, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Whenever man is made conscious of the nearness of God, his spirit should offer humble worship, and even his outward manner should render fitting obeisance to Divinity.

I saw you, brethren, just now, when the name of Jesus was mentioned in the Creed, with one accord bowing your heads. What was that for? Was there any meaning in your gesture? You did it for the same reason as that for which Moses, according to the Eastern custom, put off his shoes. You bowed in adoration and reverence to your God, you recognised the Majesty and Divinity of the Lord Jesus. Last Thursday we celebrated the fact that Jesus Christ "ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God." I think it will be suitable for us to-day to concentrate our minds specially on the truth of His Divinity. I ask you to think of the Lord Jesus to-day as "the Mighty God." There are those who profess to admire and love the memory of Jesus of Nazareth, and yet do not look on Him as Divine. This is the most common tone of unbelief in the present day. Jesus, it is admitted, was the greatest mental and moral Reformer the world ever knew. He was wonderfully enlightened and large-minded. By the intuition of genius he rose above the prejudices of His day, and gave to human thought and conduct an impulse for good that has lasted ever since. He was a talented, wise, and holy man; but nothing more.

Now speaking not as a Christian, but merely as a thinker trying to work out the problems of history, I do not see how such a theory can possibly be tenable when the facts are looked fully in the face. We have several distinct accounts of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ written not long after His death. Because they are usually bound together in one volume, we are apt to forget that they are quite distinct. Paul's letters, the Revelation of St. John (now recognised by the most careful critics as one of the earliest Christian documents), the three harmonic Gospels, the other Apostolic letters, the history called "the Acts," and lastly that beautiful book, the Gospel of St. John—these, written at different times by different hands in different countries, but all during the lifetime of Christ's contemporaries, give us in various ways descriptions of what Jesus of Nazareth did and said. All the varying accounts combine in giving us one picture of a life, and one general scheme of teaching. The story of the life unites marvellous goodness with marvellous power. The teaching unites the noblest morality with the most unheard of self-assertion. Utterly unselfish, gentle, meek, and forbearing the Teacher evidently was; yet amidst all His lessons of humility, purity, kindness, fortitude, devotion to God and duty, His principal teaching was teaching men to trust in Himself: "Come

unto Me," "Abide in Me," "Follow Me,"—such were His invitations. "Apart from Me ye can do nothing;" "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst;" "I am with you always, even to the end of the world;" "He that is ashamed of Me before men, of him will I be ashamed before the angels of heaven;" "He that confesseth Me before men, him shall I confess before the angels of heaven;" —such were His promises and threats. He came "to seek and to save the lost;" He came to be the "Light of the World;" He came so that "whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" such was His own description of His mission. Life in Himself, death without Him. Pardon, safety, peace, joy, rest, strength in union with Him; sin and misery and destruction in staying away from Him—solemnly, earnestly, continually, in various forms, He pressed these alternatives on the consciences of men.

Here, then, was the special teaching Jesus taught —Himself. Himself as the Saviour from sin, Himself as the Refuge in difficulty, Himself as the Comfort in sorrow. We, who believe in Him, know that this was just the teaching the world wanted. We know that it has brought life and strength to our own hearts and to the hearts of all who have received it. But how is such teaching consistent with the theory that He was wise and good, but only human? How delusive and misleading His lessons were if He was not Divine. Say with the Pharisees that Jesus was a deceiver. Say as Festus said of Paul, that He was "mad." Say that He was a wild, fanatical enthusiast. You say, then, that from which the moral and intellectual instinct of every thoughtful man now revolts; but your statement is consistent with itself. Say, however, that Jesus was a large-minded, far-seeing, holy Reformer of mankind, and yet that the burden of His teaching was Himself, a mere man, as the Refuge for men's souls, and you say what is manifestly self-contradictory. Good, wise, truth-loving, and yet the preacher of an utter delusion! meek and lowly, gentle and self-sacrificing, and yet putting Himself forward as the object of men's constant trust, worship, and adoration, when He was only one of themselves—is this possible or conceivable? How could one so noble and so wise put Himself on such a pedestal and draw all men to come to Him for rest and happiness and spiritual life? Only on one supposition—that He was what He indeed was and is for evermore—"Very God of very God."

And brethren, this truth of the divinity of the Lord Jesus is not a mere abstract question for theologians to argue about. It is not a doctrine that has to be "proved" by a set of hackneyed texts. It is indeed a *life truth* for each one of us. It is a fact which influences the whole tone of our daily thinking and acting. 1st. It teaches us how to think about God, how to become acquainted with Him. Who is God? What is He? Ah! how far off He seems! How can I ever really love or trust one so hidden in clouds of mystery? God is manifested in Christ Jesus. I think of Jesus taking the little children in His arms. I think of Him standing by the bier of the widow's son at Nain, and saying to the poor mother, "Weep not" I think of Him taking the blind man by the hand and leading him through the town. I think of Him holding up the frightened Peter in the midst of the waves and saying, "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" I think of the various scenes in the life of Jesus of Nazareth: I remember that this Jesus is "my Lord and my God," and then I feel that I know something about God. *What* He is I know not, but *who* He is I do know—His character and will and tone of heart towards myself—this I know; and this makes it easy for me to trust and love Him.

2nd. Again, the divinity of Christ gives me the kind of Saviour that I know and feel I want. He is human. He can be touched with the feeling of my infirmities, that is very sweet. He knows my wants. He can make allowance for my frailties. I can open my most secret feelings to Him without fear, and be sure that He understands my faltering, blundering confession. This makes Him indeed very precious to my heart—precious as a tender, sympathising Friend. But I want something more. I am so weak that I want something strong to lean on. I am so changeable and varying in my moods that I want some unchanging power to uphold me always. I am so defiled, so inconsistent, I have done so little good, I have done so much wrong that I need an infinite sacrifice for my sin. And wherever I go I am exposed to temptation. Here, there, at the most unexpected moments, the wrong impulse comes; yielding is easy, resistance is difficult. I want some guardian ever present. I want an omniscient, an omnipotent Being, to whom I can lift up my cry for help. And the time is coming, I know, when I shall feel this want even more. When the shades of death gather over me, and no earthly friend, however dear, can give me any real help; when the tender arms that are around me cannot support my spirit, and the voice that whispers so patiently and kindly in my ear cannot any longer reach my heart; when I myself, leaving the body behind, go forth into the great unknown, and have to stand face to face with God and give account of my life—then, "in the hour of death and in the day of judgment"—then I shall want some one with me indeed mighty to save.

Just such a Saviour, brethren, we have in Jesus —*man* to feel with us, *God* to deliver us; *human* in His tender brotherly pity, *divine* in His omnipotent power—our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, able to save to the uttermost those who come unto God through Him.

3rd. Once more, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." The thought of Jesus as eternal God should fill the heart with *reverence*. Much harm is done to the human race by levity—serious things are often looked at as if they were things that could be played with. Grown men and women flutter to and fro at the borders of momentous issues with a kind of childish caprice. They seem to think that they may choose as they please almost as if it did not matter how they chose. "Shall I be religious or shall I not? Shall I mind what parents and parsons and good people say, or shall I just do as I fancy myself. Wait a while. Let us see what will 'turn up.' Meanwhile, I may as well follow my fancy to-day. I daresay it will be all the same a hundred years hence."

Whose call is it that you are trifling with? Who commands you at the peril of death to turn from evil? Who invites you to flee for your life to Himself? Who speaks to your conscience as to the baseness of a worldly, selfish existence? Who stirs up within you those longings for better things. Oh! that call which sounds within you in so many ways "Come unto me"—from whom does it issue? Do you not know very well that it is from the Lord Jesus, the divine Saviour? *God* invites you, *God* commands you—God the omnipotent one. Oh! poor puny mortal, whom God could strike dead at any instant, how dare you stand hesitating as to whether you will obey Him or not? Is there any one here, hesitating, uncertain, undecided between self-will and God's will? Jesus the King of kings is beside you. He condescends to beseech you to give yourself heartily, entirely to Himself. His is the voice that calls you—the voice that once trembled on the cross as it said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do"; the voice that blended with the gust of the mountain storm as it said, "Be of good cheer, it is I." A still, small voice it is now, as it whispers and pleads in your conscience; a voice speaking in tones of thunder it will be by-and-by, when from the Throne of judgment it will pronounce your sentence. What will that sentence be? "Come, blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;" or, "Cast the unprofitable servant into outer darkness?"

"Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Oh! bow down your heart before that glorious King; ask His pardon for your base desertion of Him and your cowardly and disloyal vacillation; cast yourself in utter humiliation on His royal bounty, and now this moment you may by faith hear His voice pronouncing your absolution, "Thy sins be forgiven thee, go in peace."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1881.

SEVERAL of our subscribers have expressed approval of the line we take in reference to the agitation for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. The *Lancet* and other medical papers, as well as the letter we print from "Ich Dien," endorse the validity of our arguments. On the other hand, three clergymen, without attempting to refute our statements, disapprove our conclusion; one of whom indignantly refuses to subscribe any longer to our "so-called religious paper." We have forwarded to these gentlemen some of the evidence given by clergymen and dissenting ministers to the Select Committee of the House of Commons, and referred them to the clergy and district visitors of the towns in which the Acts are in operation, and promised to give insertion to any facts or arguments they may send in refutation of our views. Our sole object is to elicit the truth, and to promote the morality, and by consequence the physical health of our countrymen. There is no disease which makes such fearful havoc with our race as the one whose prevention is successfully accomplished by these Acts. It produces not only disease, deformity and death, but also moral and physical degeneration for four or five generations; in short it obliterates the image of the Creator in the creature, more than any of the other known penalties of sin. If the *corpus sanum* be, as we hold it is, a condition precedent to the *mens sana*, Christians, especially preachers, too much neglect the health and vigour of the body. The sanitary code of Moses should precede the ethical code of Christ. We believe the general morality of a nation or race is as much a consequence as it is undoubtedly a cause of its muscular development and physical vigour. If this be so it is expedient and surely not unscriptural to improve the health of the individual, and consequently of the race. The best way to effect this, according to our present science, is to stamp out

the modern leprosy which first invaded the human blood at the siege of Naples in 1495, and has ever since been passed on by actual contact from individual to individual; and appears, despite medical treatment, to endure throughout four or five generations. If the Contagious Diseases Acts have, as we know, enormously diminished this fell disease in the protected towns, and at the same time limited and discouraged prostitution, it behoves the clergy to master and well weigh all the facts and evidence before they join the agitation for their repeal.

THE ART OF SPEAKING AND READING.

By the Rev. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.,
Vicar of Brigstock.

(Continued from page 297.)

The work we have been recommending hitherto is purely mechanical in its nature. It involves, we are free to confess, very much drudgery. It may not on that account be dispensed with. The drudgery is of a kind that may take the place of a constitutional. Most of us need exercise. Thus someone has well said, "If our work is to be well done, nine-tenths of it must be drudgery." This is especially true here. We cannot insist on it too much or too strongly. We must practise. We cannot do any of the things well that the public speaker requires to do without learning. We do not live in the days of fairies, when we may sleep and dream and wake and find ourselves turned into very prodigies. The pathway to success in these practical days is eminently that of work. Nature has not been too bountiful to any of us. Then it is a mistake to suppose that nature does these things for us. She does not. We must learn. What is nature? What is it to do things naturally? We will answer —"Nature" means undeveloped and uncultivated powers: "naturally"—these powers working after bad models. If those who use these words so often and so glibly would analyse their thoughts, they would find that this is a correct description of them.

Now to illustrate our point. Cicero, so the story goes, was one day asked to explain the secret of oratory. He answered, "*Actio, actio, actio.*" We have put our own construction on these words, and made Cicero imply that the most perfect speaker was the man who gesticulated most in speaking. Now Cicero was a perfect orator. A perfect orator would not have said anything half so stupid. Action does enter, and largely, into the art of speaking; but it is not the whole of it. It is not the half of it. Like the shake in singing, it is almost the last thing learnt. We must therefore seek for another meaning to Cicero's words, and we have it here—"exercise, exercise, exercise;" "practise, practise, practise." The words will bear this meaning. We have now a sensible piece of advice instead of a senseless observation. At this distance of time, and data not forthcoming, we can say nothing definite in the matter; but experience points in the direction of his having undergone similar training to that which we have been inculcating.

We have been, in these papers, dealing with some very important principles. It will have been observed that we deal with principles rather than with rules. Our object is to draw out the man—develop his powers—rather than impose a model. To grasp fundamental principles and acquire the power of applying them is the way most conducive to success. We purpose, in this paper, to deal with a most important principle. It is one with which we are not generally acquainted. It is not, indeed, too much to say that most of us go about our work as if there was no such principle. And yet the power to apprehend and apply it constitutes one of the main secrets of good speaking and reading. There are secrets in the art. This is one. Mr. Boster, so it is said, fancied he had hold of the only secret. It was that of breathing through the nose. His fee for divulging it was large: and secrecy was imposed. This secret is worth infinitely more. We do not fear, however, to divulge it fully. It has always been a maxim with us that no man deserves to know anything who will not give to others the benefit of what he knows. So far as it is possible to explain it on paper, it shall be done. But let us impress upon our readers that it constitutes one of the chief embellishments of reading and speaking. Too much cannot be said of it. Too much trouble cannot be given to its accomplishment. We shall give it a name, explain it, shew how to acquire the power of applying it, and say why this power should be applied.

We call the principle that of the "*key-tone.*" But why this name? Shakespeare says, "Suit the action to the word." We go a step further and say, Suit the tone of the voice to the word. This is our reason for naming the principle that of the key-tone. *Key* suggests the idea of various pitches. Tone suggests that of the propriety of seeking to obtain congruity between the tone and the word. Hence we do not think that a better name can be given to this principle—a principle, be it remembered, which is scarcely recognised, much less allowed to operate.

There are various tones in the voice. Ordinary persons may, for singing purposes, develop two octaves. An octave at least may be developed for speaking purposes. But speaking roughly, yet intelligibly, we may say there are three main tones in the voice. These are the *low*, *middle*, and *high* tones. There are between these three tones many intervals. Now it will be found, on examination, that these tones are adapted for the several purposes for which by nature —better the God of nature—they were intended. Mark this, ye who are such sticklers for nature and being natural! The low tone is adapted for solemn, sad, serious subjects. The middle tone is adapted for ordinary subjects. The high tone is adapted to exciting, arousing, exhilarating subjects. It will not be denied that we have these several kinds of subjects, and that we deal with them. It may not be affirmed that we have not those several tones in the voice which exactly suit and befit these subjects. It can be affirmed and may not be denied that ninety-nine out of every hundred public speakers have not recognised, and, therefore, do not act upon any knowledge of these facts.

This is the writer's experience when he asks those who come to him for instruction to read a solemn subject, an ordinary subject, and an exciting one: they read them all in the same tone. They do not use those several tones which nature has so bountifully placed within their reach. Nothing is more manifest than that they do not know how to use nature's powers or draw upon her resources. "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say"—Are these things not so? And

ought they to be so? Then, "Pourquoi n'avons nous pas changé tout cela?"

It appears, then, that we must do three things in order to have the power of apprehending and applying this principle. They are these: (1) Train the voice to produce these tones accurately. (2) Train the ear to distinguish them easily. And (3) Train the mind to select them readily. It is a simple matter of training. The training is easy enough for young speakers who have not fixed bad habits by constant practice. It may be accomplished by all; though, it must be confessed that the work is more difficult as the habit, to be overcome, is more inveterate.

It may be that in making a passing observation on the subject of monotoning we are going a little out of our way; but, perhaps, we are not. Any way we may be pardoned, seeing that we feel there is a "better way." We may as well say at once, and boldly, notwithstanding the risk of treading on tender corns, The practice is not a good one. It is contrary to nature, to common sense, and to reason. This is strong language. We hope it may be kindly excused. But "your reason, Jack, your reason," some of our readers may say. They have a right to a reason. We give it:—

We have already noticed that the subjects with which we deal are very varied in their nature, and that there are tones in the voice—at least there may be tones in the voice—that suit these varied subjects. The conclusion we drew was that the speaker should suit the tone to the word. Now the subjects of the morning or evening service, although all religious in their nature, are very varied in their kind. The sentences differ from the exhortation, the exhortation from the confession, and so on. We have a great variety of subjects. Besides these general differences there are differences of no slight degree in the several subjects themselves. And all these differences demand for their due expression a peculiar tone. And of all this, it is impossible for monotoning to take account. Therefore, it should not be practised.

Nor are the reasons given for it sufficient to justify its retention. It is easier for the reader. We question this. It covers defects. Does it? All can hear. But do they profit? It produces harmony. But what if also its influence is soporific? But make every possible allowance, and then it must be admitted that it spoils the man. It is not natural. Nature demands congruity. The tone must sympathise with the idea. This is nature and art too. It does not reach home. It does not arouse. It strikes no chord in the heart of the listener. There is no *rapport de sentiment* between the speaker and the audience, unless it be that of general heartlessness. "Face answers to face in water;" but heart does not answer here to heart. If we recognise it as a principle that the tone of the voice should suit the matter then all that we have said follows as result follows cause. Let our readers judge for themselves of the following fact. The writer once lectured at St. Augustine's, Canterbury. He had an extreme wish to visit the Cathedral and know its main features architecturally and otherwise. To this end he solicited and received the kind help of the subwarden of the college. An hour was fixed for the visit. The writer was there a few minutes before his time. Presently he heard a voice from a distant corner of the edifice. He stopped, wondered, listened. It cannot surely be a service! It is neither the hour nor the place. An explanation was soon forthcoming; for the verger presently issued forth with a party of visitors. He was giving his explanation of things historical and architectural *à la* clerical! Let us acknowledge the compliment and learn the moral. There is a tone of voice which befits in a peculiar way every subject. That tone is not always one and the same. It varies, and the variety is very great. The mind, as we have said, must be trained to appreciate and choose it. Surely a trained mind will see that the tone which suits the matter of worship does not suit equally well that of historical descriptions.

We could not but feel, if we thought seriously of the matter, that this adoption of one tone for general use savours a little of the ridiculous. It is only custom that has made it tolerable. But there are further reasons for adopting the better way. We have, however, sufficiently prolonged this paper. We will reserve what we have still to say for another paper, when it will also be our object to explain how to acquire and to apply this principle. If in our ardour and out of love for our subject we have said hard things, we hope our readers will kindly excuse and give us credit for simply wishing to promote the Art of Speaking and Reading.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Your excellent leader on the above Act should, in my humble opinion, be re-published *pro bono publico*, in order to arrest the agitation now being made to have it repealed. I perfectly harmonize with your views on the essential points; I cannot see anything either unjust, immoral, or unscriptural in that Act. As to any interference with personal liberty, it is perfectly justifiable, for the moral and material interests of the community, that those unfortunate ones who carry on an unblushing trade in vice should be subjected to compulsory treatment, in order to rescue other members of society from a sore infliction. By far the greater number of admissions to hospital, in the Army, are from disease resulting from that contagion which the above Act has done so much to expose. "The Contagious Diseases Act" I believe to be one of the greatest blessings that has yet fallen upon man.

11th July, 1881. ICH DIEN.

Reviews and Notices.

INDIVIDUALISM: ITS GROWTH AND TENDENCIES; WITH SOME SUGGESTIONS AS TO THE REMEDY FOR ITS EVILS. Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, November, 1880. By the Right Rev. A. N. Littlejohn, D.D., Bishop of Long Island. Cambridge and London: Deighton, Bell and Co. 1881.

The English are always ready to listen to a man who has got anything to say really worth saying. Dramatist, poet, painter, theologian, or agnostic—all in England will gain the attention of the public, provided they be men of talent. Of late years a special

courtesy towards foreign ability has grown up ; and insular prejudice seems on its death-bed. But in the welcome given by Cambridge to the Bishop of Long Island there was additional heartiness, for he belongs to the great English speaking republic across the Atlantic, and represents a vigorous branch of the Church in that country. But his message to us is by no means a cheerful one. His three masterly sermons on "*Individualism*" are full of gloomy foreboding. Like the prophets of old, he stands with warning arm uplifted to arrest, if may be, the wrong-headed tendencies of the age. What he calls *Individualism* is the growing danger of the time. His first sermon, occupying sixty-six pages, is a powerful statement of the evils arising from "the exaggeration of the relative importance of the individual" and his undue self-assertion. What the ancients lacked, England and America have too much of. In the early stages of society "there was no true idea of man as man." Neither Sparta nor Rome were troubled with the idea of the majesty of the individual. The State was everything, the individual nothing. Now, however, the tide sets in a contrary direction, and "the individual emerges more and more as the central figure." This "*Democratic Individualism*" clashes with the Family, the State, the Church, and, if allowed to go forward, may endanger them all. Bishop Littlejohn's alarm seems to increase with his eloquence. Individualism is a kind of moral blight spoiling the individual ; morality generally, and the polity of the Church in particular. The absolutism of public opinion, the phases of modern socialism, and the puny results of modern art, and art-impulse, are all the effect of individualism. "Our mediocrity is faith's revenge upon our unbelief." "Individualism leavens art with a spirit of egoism. Real originality is the product only of minds that gladly accept baptism into a life larger than their own." Page follows page on the "*leanness of art*" until one blushes to think one ever admired anything in the Royal Academy. The chapter closes with a sentiment almost a truism. "As art cannot be truly great when the individual is shorn of the free play of his faculties : so neither can it be truly great when the individual pushes his liberty into license, his individual*ity* into Individual*ism*." The more Bishop Littlejohn deals with the topic the more gigantic are the proportions of this modern hydra "*Individualism*."

The second sermon supplies the "*Counter Truths*." "What is the teaching demanded by these evils ?" "Christianity must prove itself to be the only authoritative and complete exhibition of God's revealed discipline for man." Unless, however, a race of "Bishop Butlers" should appear, this task will be too much for most of us. In fact, this chapter on "*Counter Truths*" will dishearten any ordinary person in his attempts to attack Individualism. "*A theology resting on outward realities*," is no doubt the right antidote, but this age demands a kind of proof for the "*outward realities*" which it is impossible to give.

Whether the "Institutional Checks and Limitations" afforded by the Family, the State, and the Church, mentioned in sermon three, will avail to stem the modern stream of Individualism, remains to be seen.

The Bishop of Long Island has, however, done good service by calling attention to the dangers inseparable from exaggerated Individualism ; though he appears more at home when stating the symptoms of disease than when suggesting remedies.

"A Letter to the Rev. C. Voysey, from a Christian Theist." London : Provost and Co. Pp. 32.

There is a proverbial saying, "Converts are always enthusiasts," and we can recollect it being wittily illustrated in the House of Commons by the case of an Highlander, who, when he was converted to the breeks, began by wearing a pair twice as large as anybody else did. It appears that Mr. Voysey is charged by one of his friends with an excess of this sort ; that is to say, with carrying his revolt from orthodox theology to an unreasonable extreme, and wearing his scepticism twice as broad as it need be. Hence proceeds this letter of remonstrance. Mr. Voysey, it is well known, has abjured, not the Anglican doctrines alone, which were his earlier faith, but Christianity itself, root and branch, and has repudiated the name of Christian altogether. In his opinion, "Christianity *corrupted* the purest and noblest elements of Judaism, and only incorporated the purest and noblest elements of Paganism." Hence whatever his present creed may be, he does not trace its descent to himself through Christianity. He goes further back, up the stream of religious belief, and affiliates himself to pre-Christian conceptions, thereby treating Christianity as a mere aberration and monstrosity, lying outside the true line of development. To use a familar metaphor, he considers Christianity to have poured nothing but sewage into the stream, and to get a pure draught he must tap the current higher up. It is against this excess of repudiation that his friend remonstrates, while heartily sympathising with him in his iconoclastic zeal against orthodox theology. "In renouncing the name of Christian," he says, "you are breaking with the past, and ignoring the law of continuity." No doubt of it ! As a matter of fact, Mr. Voysey has been dandled and nurtured in Christianity ; and, far as he has receded from it now, it has somehow been a factor in making him what he has become. He is not, nor can he be, as though he had sprung directly out of Judaism or one of the many forms of Paganism, and had never come into contact with the plastic influence of Christianity. But if we take the remonstrance seriously, the principle at the bottom of it has a curious consequence. Let us suppose the hereditary disciples of Mahomet, or Buddha, or Confucius, struggling through their own faith into a purer theism, without coming into contact with Christianity at all. Then Christianity would lie outside the line of their religious development, and would have no claim to be recognised by them on the ground of the law of continuity. While Mr. Voysey ought to call himself a Christian, because his theism came to him through Christianity ; these other theists, though they have reached the same stage and hold the same belief, must be regarded as having no business with Christianity in any shape. Thus we should have a number of different classes of theists, designated not by what they believe, but by what they have passed through on their way to belief. This consequence Mr. Voysey's monitor frankly accepts. "Nor do I see," he writes, "why there should not be Christian theists, Mahometan theists, Buddhist theists, and so on, each developing out of, not denying, its own past." The only difficulty is to attach any practical importance to the retention of the epithet *Christian* for a belief from which, in the course of its manufacture, every characteristic element of Christianity has been confessedly strained out. At any rate, from us who believe that God has spoken to

all mankind by His Son, and called them into a holy fellowship of which His Son is the divine Head and Bond of union, the position, both of Mr. Voysey and his remonstrant friend, is too remote to allow of the difference between them being otherwise than practically insignificant.

"RELIGION FREED FROM STATE CONTROL:" A Charge delivered to the Clergy, Churchwardens, and Sidesmen of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, at his fifth Visitation (May 11th, 1881), by James Augustus Hessey, D.C.L., Archdeacon of Middlesex. London: T. Scott. 1881.

We welcome once more the annual charge of the scholarly Archdeacon of Middlesex. The prominent theme on this occasion is, as is natural, the efforts of the so-called "Liberation Society" to separate Church and State. Additional prominence and piquancy are given to this subject just now by the very frank avowal of the Liberationists that what they intend to carry is a very complete scheme indeed of Disestablishment and Disendowment—much more complete than that which has befallen the Irish Church. The Archdeacon of Middlesex points out very appositely that if by "liberation from State control" we are to understand "exemption from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of law," no such liberation is possible; any minister of religion possessing a meeting-house may very probably have to appear before the Queen's Bench or the Court of Chancery, however slight may be his connexion with the State. Perhaps some of the clergy who desire Disestablishment, thinking (it would seem) that in a Disestablished Church every priest might do what is right in his own eyes, would do well to ponder the question, whether imprisonment by the Court of Chancery for disregard of its own injunctions would be pleasanter than imprisonment for disregard of the monition of the Court of Arches. As a general rule, there can be no doubt that Lord Selborne (quoted by Dr. Hessey) is right when he says that "the effect of Disestablishment would be, that most points in controversy would be ruled more strictly against minorities by the legislative assembly of a disestablished church than they are likely to be by the courts of law." In fact, if the Church were disestablished to-morrow, the Ritualists would find themselves out in the cold on the next day. Lord Selborne (then Sir Roundell Palmer) also thought, in 1871, that "the great majority [of the clergy] will agree, that the principle of obedience to law is of infinitely greater importance than any disputed form of ritual whatever." We most sincerely hope that he is right here, too. We agree entirely with Archdeacon Hessey, that "it may be questioned whether the Church, supposing it to be disestablished, can ever be that comprehensive, liberal body which it is now."

Another scheme on which the Archdeacon touches is Mr. Albert Grey's preposterous Bill for the establishment of "Church Boards," elected by the ratepayers; a Bill, that is, for permitting the Jews, infidels, and heretics of a parish to regulate the worship of the Church people. Indeed, those who are interested in the Church will find any subjects of ecclesiastical interest which have come into prominence during the past year discussed in a clear and animated style in Dr. Hessey's pages.

The guardians of Richmond, Surrey, lately resolved, by seven to two, to return to Mrs. Stopford a photographic scrap representing the Crucifixion, which that lady had given to an inmate, a sick girl, to be hung over her bed. In the course of a conversation on the subject, the Rev. T. Headley said it was perfectly hideous to see a representation of a corpse exhibited like that. At a subsequent meeting of the board, Admiral Stopford, who is a member of the board, is reported to have "made some strong remarks with reference to the conduct of the board in returning to Mrs. Stopford a picture of the crucified Saviour which she had presented to one of the inmates. He said that he took upon himself the responsibility of the picture being given to the poor woman, whose days might be said to be numbered. He denounced the action of the board as 'savage, cruel, and intolerant.'" The chairman (Mr. W. J. Denton), as the mover of the resolution directing the picture to be returned, said he did not want to enter into a theological discussion. He was a Christian himself, and he hoped every gentlemen present was, but they did not worship a dead Christ.

The *Record* says it has been resolved by certain members of various Christian denominations to observe Saturday, the 23rd inst., or where that is not possible, Sunday, the 24th, with regard to the following subjects:—"I. Thanksgiving to God for mercies to the nation, for the gracious work of His Spirit in our midst, and for the numbers who are working for Christ. II. Humiliation for our national sins; want of devotedness to God; want of union amongst Christians; indifferentism and unbelief; intemperance—impurity; dishonour to God's Holy Name and Word; neglect of the Lord's Day. III. Intercession. 1. That God's Name and law may be honoured by the nation at large in all its acts. 2. That the purity of Christian life and Christian teaching, both public and private, may be so quickened by God's grace that a more effectual standard may be lifted up against evil growing around us. 3. That all those who acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour may be constrained increasingly to love one another, and that, being redeemed by the same precious death, they may be afresh consecrated by His Holy Spirit, with one heart to labour for the honour of His name and the spread of His Gospel at home and abroad." Amongst those who concur in the proposal are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Bath and Wells, Bangor, Chichester, Cork, Dover, Liverpool, Meath, Ripon, Truro, Tuam, and Winchester; Bishop Perry, the Earl of Aberdeen, High Commissioner to the Church of Scotland; the Deans of Canterbury, York, Gloucester and Ripon; Dr. Angus, President of the Regent's Park Baptist College; Mr. Jenkins, President, and Mr. Arthur, late President, of the Wesleyan Conference; Professor Charteris, Edinburgh; Principal Brown, of Aberdeen; Dr. H. Bonar; Dr. Stoughton; Dr. Sinclair Paterson; Canons Carus, Cadman, Fleming, Forester, Battersby, Richardson, and Jackson; Revs. C. J. P. Eyre, rector of Marylebone; H. L. Fox, Westminster; H. N. Sherbrooke, Portman Chapel; H. Webb Peploe, Onslow Square; Donald Fraser, Scotch Church; F. Fox, rector of Upper Chelsea; the Marquis of Cholmondeley; the Earls of Shaftesbury, Cavan; Earl Nelson; Lords Alfred Churchill, Gilbert Kennedy, Polworth, Mount Temple, Radstock; Hon. H. Tollemache; Sir Thomas Chambers, M.P.; Mr. Hind Smith, Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, Exeter Hall; Sir

John Kennaway, M.P.; Sir Harry Verney, M.P.; Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley; Rev. G. Body, Rev. W. J. Knox-Little, Rev. A. Gurney (St. Barnabas, Pimlico), Canons Basil and Ernest Wilberforce; Sir William Muir; Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P.; Mr. C. H. Spurgeon; Mr. S. A. Blackwood, &c.

On Monday the clergy of Lincoln were cited to elect a Proctor for Convocation in the room of Canon Perry, who has resigned. At noon the Bishop, accompanied by Mr. Swan, the registrar, and the Apparitor-General, entered the Consistorial Court. Archdeacon Kaye shortly after came in, but had to leave after the Bishop's address. The Bishop wore his Convocation robe of scarlet cloth over a lawn rochet, and his hood, made familiar to so many by the portrait presented by the diocese, and exhibited at the Royal Academy the year before last. His lordship also wore his pectoral cross. The Bishop began by inviting the clergy to prayer, and said several Latin collects; after which his lordship passed a warm eulogium on the retiring Proctor, especially noting his literary labours, his "Church History," his "Lives of St. Hugh and Grosstete." He then for half an hour dwelt on the long roll of learned and illustrious men who had been connected with the Church of Lincoln from the twelfth century, dwelling more particularly on Parker, Wake, Gibson, Inett, and Warburton, not forgetting the great Walter Hook, vicar of Leeds, who was presented with a stall by Bishop Kaye for his historical work. The Bishop urged the clergy to the study of the works of our great English divines, and said that if such a man as Dr. Hook could do the work of a parish priest so well, and yet find time to write as he did, what might not many do with lighter parochial cares? Besides Canon Perry, the Bishop noticed the learned work of Canon Overton as an instance of what he meant. The perusal of party newspapers and periodicals was no substitute for such reading. The Bishop then called on the clergy to propose their Proctor. Canon Bullock, rector of Welton and organising secretary for the archdeaconry of Stowe, proposed Canon Wilde, rector of Louth, and Rural Dean. Canon Bullock spoke very warmly of Canon Wilde, to whom a requisition had been sent, signed by between three and four hundred of the clergy. Inquiry had been made as to Mr. Wilde's views on a variety of subjects—as, for example, the Ornaments Rubric, Mr. Green's imprisonment, and the Final Court of Appeal—as to all of which Canon Bullock said the clergy might trust Mr. Wilde without fettering him by pledges. Canon Barrett briefly seconded the nomination, speaking of Canon Wilde as a successful parish priest. The Bishop was about to put the proposal to the vote, when the Rev. T. Mossman rose, and pointed out the mandates of the Archbishop and Dean of the province mentioned all and singular clerks and literate persons, and the other clergy; whereas the Bishop's citation to the diocese was only to rectors, vicars, and perpetual curates. The Bishop explained that he had only followed the usual form and precedent. Mr. Mossman then stated that the Bishop and Archbishop had sanctioned a great innovation in voting-papers, which had required an Act of Parliament to make valid for the Universities; and yet it was stated that the Archbishop had no power to give the franchise to curates or to enlarge the number of Proctors. The Bishop having again explained, put the nomination, which was unanimously agreed to. Canon Wilde returned thanks for the confidence shown him, and, glancing at the topics of burning interest, gave satisfactory warrant for what Canon Bullock had stated of his views. He was as desirous as anybody for the release of Mr. Green; he acknowledged the difficulties there were in the way of any alteration in the Ornaments Rubric, and as to the Final Court of Appeal he spoke of it as now on its trial before the Commission. Allusions to the Public Worship Regulation Act by several speakers elicited an evident feeling that the whole Act was a mistake, and that the sooner it was out of the statute-book the better. Canon Perry, also, in a few feeling and hearty words, returned thanks for the great kindness which had been shown him by the Bishop and clergy.

A somewhat novel spectacle has been witnessed recently in the outlying parts of the historic village of Cliffe-at-Hoo, the ancient Cloveshoo. The rector has held an extra evening service in the open air, supported by the choir and several members of the congregation. These services have been well attended by persons not otherwise often or ever seen in church.

The daily papers state that a letter has been received from the Bishop of Rochester refusing to allow the Rev. W. Thompson, the successful candidate in the recent contest for the chaplaincy of St. Saviour's, Southwark, to read himself in until the allegations as to the bribery and corruption at the election have been cleared. The result of the polling and the manner in which it was carried on have led to four out of the six wardens sending in their resignations, and several private meetings of the vestry have been held with a view to bring about an amicable understanding. Mr. Thompson's supporters allege that they have no paid agents.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, on the recommendation of the Archbishop of York, has conferred the degree of D.D. on the Ven. R. F. L. Blunt, Archdeacon of the East Riding, and Vicar of Scarborough, Yorks.

Mr. R. G. Wilberforce, of Lavington House, Petworth, asks whether any of our readers will lend him, for the purposes of Vol. III. of his father's Life, a copy of the Report of the Oxford Church Congress of 1862:—"I need scarcely add that the book would be carefully kept and promptly returned. As I am writing, will you further permit me to say how grateful I should be for any anecdotes which may illustrate my father's life? Many of the reviewers have complained that I have not given enough stories, but they forget that the Bishop did not keep a record of his own stories, and that for these I have had to depend on my own memory and on the recollections of those who have kindly helped me."

In regard to missionary intercession, "A Country Parson," knowing how difficult it is to get people together at these busy times of the year, offers a suggestion to his brethren in country districts—viz., have a special Sunday evening service of intercession. "If, in the morning and afternoon sermons, really interesting missionary information is previously given (N.B., no collection), I don't think we shall have to complain of want of interest, or attendance, in the evening. The Sunday after Ascension Day may commend itself to many for such a service as I have suggested."

On the 7th inst. the first meeting of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences was held at the board-room of the National Society, Mr. Cecil Raikes in the chair. After prayer a report was read and explanations given by Archdeacon Emery. The follow-

ing provisional constitution, with rules, was then adopted for 1881-2, and referred for further consideration to the Executive Committee :—

"A. The object of the Central Council shall be to give greater unity of action to diocesan conferences by considering, through representative members, the resolutions at which such conferences may have arrived, and other subjects ; that so the general opinion of the Church at large may be obtained on matters affecting its welfare, with a view to their being brought prominently, if thought desirable, before the Convocations and Parliament.

"B. The action of the Central Council shall be free from political bias.

"C. The Central Council shall consist of representatives from diocesan conferences. Members of either House of Parliament or of the Convocations, and members of diocesan conferences, though not representatives, may be present at any general meeting, and may, with the permission of the chairman of such meeting, speak but not vote.

"D. A chairman shall be nominated every year and shall be re-eligible.

"E. There shall be an Executive Committee nominated every year, consisting of twenty persons, of whom the chairman of the council, the secretaries, and the treasurer shall be *ex officio* members, five to form a quorum.

"F. The principal duties of the Executive Committee shall be :—

"1. To summon meetings of the Central Council, as occasion may require ; provided always that one meeting shall be summoned every year as near as may be to the week in which Parliament assembles, at which meeting the report for the year shall be read.

"2. To keep diocesan conferences informed of the measures brought forward in Parliament or in Convocation affecting the Church, and also to inform them of the subjects suggested by the Central Council for discussion.

"3. To request the secretaries of diocesan conferences to supply the reports and resolutions of their respective bodies to the Central Council.

"4. To prepare by-laws for submission from time to time to the council."

Mr. Raikes was accordingly appointed chairman, and the following were elected secretaries :—Archdeacon Emery, Mr. F. H. Dickinson, the Rev. W. T. Jones, and Mr. Stanley Leighton, M.P. Mr. Magniac, M.P., consented to act as treasurer. A summary of measures affecting the Church now before Parliament, with principal subjects before the Convocations and a short account of the organisation and work of the Diocesan Conference, was then given. After reference to a proposition lately made of the desirableness of providing a Church Year-book in connection with diocesan calendars, a debate was opened by Mr. Leighton, upon the following resolution :—

"That the attention of Churchmen should be directed to Church legislation, and that the resolution of diocesan, archidiaconal, and ruridecanal conferences should be more immediately brought under the notice of the members of both Houses of Parliament connected with the several districts."

This was seconded by Mr. Cropper, M.P., and carried *nem. con.*, after some discussion as to the expediency of passing such resolutions at this meeting. The next resolution was moved by Mr. F. S. Powell, and seconded by Lord Henry Scott, M.P. :—

"That this council suggests for discussion at the next meeting of the diocesan conference the Hon. E. Stanhope's Bill, as originally introduced into Parliament, for removing the abuses incident to the present law with reference to the sale of livings."

The previous question, and an amendment (which was in favour of supporting the Bill now before Parliament) having been put and lost, the original resolution was carried unanimously. The next resolution was moved by Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, M.P., seconded by Mr. Dickinson, and, with some alterations, was carried in the following form :—

"That this council earnestly recommends diocesan conferences and Church organisations forthwith to take means for representing their collective opinions on the constitution of ecclesiastical courts to the Royal Commission appointed to report on the subject."

The following were appointed as an executive committee :—Messrs. Cecil Raikes, Cropper, M.P., Wilbraham Egerton, M.P., Magniac, M.P., R. H. Paget, M.P., G. W. E. Russell, M.P., F. S. Powell, F. H. Dickinson, Stanley Leighton, M.P., W. E. Hubbard, Jun., Archdeacon Hannah, the Deans of Lichfield and Bangor, Archdeacon Emery, the Rev. Chancellor Espin, Archdeacon Hobhouse, the Hon. and Rev. Latimer Neville, Canon Temple, Canon Howel Evans, and the Rev. W. T. Jones. It was also resolved :—

"That it be left to the Executive Committee to fix and arrange for the next meeting of the Central Council.

"That this council recommends that the conferences which have not already nominated be invited to nominate three clergy and three laymen as representatives."

With hearty thanks to the chairman and Archdeacon Emery, the meeting separated. A large proportion of the delegates, lay and clerical, were present.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Butt, Rev. Walter William Arthur, vicar of Westbury, Wilts.
Field, Rev. John Edward, vicar of Benson, Oxon.
Fleming, Rev. Canon, succentor of York Cathedral.
Hey, Ven. Archdeacon, succentor ; precentor and prebendary of Driffield annexed in York Cathedral.
Hitchcock, Rev. W. M., honorary canon of Durham Cathedral, and rector of Whitburn ; vicar of Romford, Essex.
Irvine, Rev. A. C., vicar of St. Mary, Warwick ; surrogate.
Nicholson, Rev. John Aldwell, late minister of Christ Church, Leamington ; minister of St. Alban's, Warwick Street, Leamington.
Pennell, Rev. George Barrow, vicar of Chislehampton-with-Stadhampton, Oxon.
Price, Rev. G. F., vicar of Romford, Essex ; rector of Whitburn.
Ranger, Rev. Apsley C., vicar of Pulloxhill, Beds.
Ross-Lewin, Rev. George Harrison, vicar of Benfieldside.
Vardon, Rev. Stanley Arthur, vicar of All Saints', Langton Green, Tunbridge Wells.
Werninck, Rev. Charles, curate of St. Nicholas, Worcester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cumming, Rev. John, D.D., late minister of the National Scotch Church, Crown Court, London, at Chiswick, on the 5th inst., aged 73.
Fisher, Rev. William Frederick, M.A., vicar of Shalfleet, Isle of Wight, on the 30th ult., aged 55.
Webber, Rev. William Charles Fynes, M.A., Christ Church, Oxon, sub-dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, late rector (for thirty-five years) of St. Botolph Without, Aldersgate, at Lausanne, suddenly, on the 27th ult., aged 65.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE REVISED VERSION.

By the Rev. F. TILNEY BASSETT, M.A.,
Vicar of Dulverton, Somerset.

Sermon Preached at Dulverton on Sunday, May 29, 1881.

"So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading."—Nehem. viii. 8.

IN redemption of the promise made to you last Sunday, my dear brethren, I proceed to consider as our subject this morning the Revised Version of the New Testament, which within the last few days has been given to the world at large. The period in which such a work comes before the Church at home, in the colonies and dependencies of our empire, and in America, and wherever the English language is spoken, must necessarily be a season of inquiry and of anxiety. Many who are now settled in their opinion upon various texts and their teaching will become unsettled; and it may be that some who are unsettled will find a satisfactory solution of their difficulties, and be strengthened in their faith. Under such circumstances we shall all agree that this ought to be a time of prayer that He, who is the Author of the Word, would vouchsafe to direct, sanctify, and govern the hearts of men, that in reading and studying this translation of the Scriptures a blessing may result to the Church at large, and the kingdom of God be more firmly established.

I. In the first place we must remind you that the translation of the Holy Scriptures is not a new thing. You are aware that the Old Testament was written by its various authors in the Hebrew language, and the New Testament in Greek. Our text brings before us the first effort on record of rendering the original into another tongue. The Jews during their captivity at Babylon had laid aside their native Hebrew, and adopted the language of the country where they were in bondage, that is the Chaldee. For this cause, when they returned to their own land, it was necessary that Ezra and his fellow priests should, after reading the original text of the Law, give a running translation or commentary in the tongue with which their hearers had grown familiar, that they might hear the Word of God in "a tongue understanded of the people." From this practice arose the commentaries which are known as Targums. The first grand systematic attempt, however, to represent the Hebrew Scriptures in another language was commenced in the third century before Christ, at the instance, it is said, of a King of Egypt. There are various accounts current of the origination of the scheme as well as of the plan on which it was carried out; but these points are certain, that the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek at the period we have named, and that it received the name of the Septuagint from the belief that seventy (or seventy-two) learned men performed the work, that it was practically the Authorized Version, so to speak, with the Jews that were dispersed among the Greek-speaking nations, and from them passed to the same high position in the early Christian Church. It is quoted by the Apostles in their writings, and was the basis on which the Creeds of the Church and the disputations with the heathen and with heretics were founded. The Jews, finding that the Christians made very effective use of the Septuagint in their arguments to establish the Deity of Christ and the truth of His mission, resorted to fresh translations in their own interest—three such were made in the second century by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; these works only remain to us in fragments, which were collected and published about a hundred years ago by Mountfaucon, and recently by the learned Dr. Field, who is a member of the Old Testament Revision Company.

Coming to translations of the whole Bible, that is of both Old and New Testaments, the first and most excellent is the Syriac. This version was made at the beginning of the second century at the latest; it is possible that the Old Testament portion was in existence before the coming of Christ. The special feature that renders this version of so much interest is, that Syriac was the language of the Apostles, and consequently in the Gospels we may have the very words of the Lord Himself as pronounced in the tongue in which He uttered them. About the same date the Old Italic Version was accomplished; the text translated was that of the Septuagint, the Early Greek Version which I have already mentioned. This was the Bible used by the early Latin Fathers. In the fourth century the text of this version was revised by St. Jerome, who becoming dissatisfied with his labours, determined to acquaint himself with the Hebrew, and the outcome of this resolve, which he carried into effect, was a new translation of the Old Testament direct from its original. This, with his revision of the New Testament, after a long and sharp struggle, became the accepted Bible of the Western Church, and remained so for about a thousand years. It is still the authorized text of the Church of Rome, and is the treasure-house from which almost all our doctrinal and ecclesiastical phraseology is derived. This work is known as the Latin Vulgate. Other versions were made. Amongst them, it may be interesting to know, that as early as the fourth century a translation was executed in the Anglo-Saxon, a language which is parent to our own—a copy of this, made in the sixth century, is now

at Upsala, in Sweden. Bede, the great Church historian who flourished in the eighth century, it is well known, made a translation of St. John's Gospel in the same language, and died as he was completing his holy task.

We now come down to the times of the Reformation. In the fourteenth century Wycliffe, who may be called the father of that great movement, translated the New Testament from the Latin Vulgate into English. Tyndale, who died a martyr to his work, published the New Testament in 1525; he has left the impress of his genius and style on our Authorised Version, and through it on the present Revision. Coverdale, afterwards Bishop of Exeter, followed with the translation of the whole Bible in 1535. Matthew's Bible, a feigned name, it was really the work of Rogers, who was the first martyr under the Marian persecution, came out in 1537. This was followed by Taverner's in 1539. The great Bible also came out with the authority of Archbishop Cranmer in the same year. The refugees at Geneva had been at work during their expatriation, and produced the fruits of their labours in 1560. This was the most popular version in England for many years. The Bishops' Bible, under the approval of Archbishop Parker, appeared in 1568. On King James I. coming to the throne, an appeal was made to him, among other demands, that a new translation of the Bible should be made; he shrewdly saw the opportunity, and threw himself with interest into the work. The Authorised Version was the result; it was commenced in 1606, and completed in 1611. Thus it will appear that in eighty-six years no less than eight revisions were effected —and it is no small honour that the Authorised Version has held its ground for more than two centuries and a-half during a period chequered with every variety of religious thought, of depression and revival. It has been the court of appeal of every sect as well of the Church. It has braced the nerves and girded the loins of men engaged in all the active businesses of life, and has whispered the last words of consolation to the dying. During the last quarter of a century, at least, various proposals and suggestions for a fresh revision have been made in different quarters, and some specimens of private efforts have been issued from the press, but in 1870 the Convocation of Canterbury set in action a scheme for carrying into effect the desired task; two companies were formed, one for the revision of the Old Testament, and the other for that of the New; the co-operation of divines in America was afterwards invited and obtained. The rules for the guidance of the revisers may be briefly summed up, that revision, not new translation, was to be the object in view, and that no alterations should be made except where really necessary, and that the style and language of the Authorised Version should be closely followed. Further, the companies were empowered to invite the aid of any scholars of repute, irrespective of nation or creed. This provision may appear to many to be large and liberal, but I fear there is evidence that such an association of incongruous elements has introduced a general constitutional weakness into the whole work, and in certain places unmistakable marks of compromise and probably of error. Such, however, was the plan of operations, and the outcome of the combined efforts of the revisers now brought to a close, so far as the Scriptures of the New Covenant are concerned, is the New Revision now placed in our hands.

II. We may pass on to inquire why this work was necessary? To this we may reply that when the Authorised Version and its predecessors were framed, there were no ancient MSS. at hand to be consulted, and probably the different translators employed only the then recent editions of the Greek Testament. Since that period, however, ancient MSS. of the greatest value have come to light, and been carefully studied. There is one, I may tell you, in the Vatican Library at Rome (over which a jealous watch is kept) of the fourth century; one in the British Museum of the following century, given as a present to King Charles I. by a reforming patriarch of the Greek Church. Another in the University Library at Cambridge, presented by Beza, the noted Reformer, probably of the fifth century also. It has been thought by some that this MS. was consulted in the framing of the received text of which our Authorised Version is a translation. In 1859 a complete MSS. was found in the convent of St. Catherine, on Mount Sinai, a most valuable addition to our Biblical treasures; its date is of the fourth century. It has been concluded by many scholars that the more ancient the manuscript is, the more pure the text that it presents, although this opinion is by no means a universal one, and hence it was felt that the Christian Church at large ought to have the benefit of the light that is shed upon the scriptures by these early witnesses.

Again, scholarship in the Greek language has largely increased of late years, and such an advance ought to be brought to bear upon the most precious of all books that has come down to us in that tongue. Moreover, the old translation was known to be faulty, specially in the rendering of the tenses of verbs, in the presence or absence of the definite article, in the use of different English words to express the same word in the original, and the same to represent different ones, and it may be added the readings of various texts and even passages were open to doubt or subject to discussion. For these reasons a new revision was deemed a want by most thoughtful Christians.

III. Our next inquiry is, How has the task of Revision been carried out in the present effort? We confess that grammatically the work is more

correct than its predecessor : that every page, verse, we may almost add line, bears the impress of the greatest painstaking and most laborious endeavours to exhibit a literal and accurate representation of the original ; yet we cannot forbear expressing the opinion that it is very inferior in style and general tone to the Authorised Version, the grand roll and rhythm of its periods are often broken and rendered inharmonious, and a general sense steals over us of a stiffness on the one hand owing to the literal character of the translation, and of dislocation on the other from the lack of that sweet continuity of clauses and sentences which is one of the best features of our English language. Hence our verdict would be that the New Revision is not so much an English Version as a Greek-English one, and that it is more suited to be a student's manual than the Bible of the simple Christian who reads for spiritual comfort rather than exactitude of translation.

We now select a few passages to illustrate the character of the work, and first I shall refer to one or two improvements in the *readings* of the text. In St. Mark xi. 3, the Authorised Version reads, "And if any man say unto you, Why do ye this? [*i.e.*, loose the colt] say ye that the Lord hath need of him, and straightway he will send him hither." This looks as if it meant that the owner would send the animal for the use required, but three out of the four ancient MSS. to which we have referred add in the last clause the word "*again*" or "*back.*" This reading is adopted in the Revision, in which we read, "and straightway He will send him back hither" ; that is, the Lord will return the owner his loan—and this meaning, doubtless the true one, we may add, though latent in the parallel passage in St. Matthew, is not contrary to it. Take another example of far greater importance. In Rev. xxii. 14, the Authorised Version has, "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life," &c., whereas two of the oldest MSS. which contain the Apocalypse and the Latin Vulgate, have the reading which is represented in the Revision, "Blessed are they that wash their robes," &c.

If we find improvements in some of the readings adopted, we shall also, I fear, meet with cases of an opposite character. It is exceedingly difficult to define to a general and mixed congregation the intricate science of the textual critic. The fields to be surveyed consist of a vast number of MSS. written during the course of a thousand years, many versions or translations of the original into different languages at a more or less early date, and the quotations of passages and texts of Scripture scattered up and down the voluminous literature of the Fathers. A moment's reflection will suggest what an accomplished and delicate judgment must be exercised in the choice and adoption of special readings ; the balance, in some cases, even to practised minds, between competitive claims is often but very slightly preponderating on one side, and in others so even that anything like certainty is impossible ; and perhaps we may add that there is scarcely a reading to which we are accustomed that has been rejected that has not something, and ofttimes a great deal, to be advanced in its favour. All this makes the study of which we are speaking one that requires scholarship, experience, sound judgment, and wise caution. Hence I cannot help feeling that, as the very rudiments of the science are unknown to the vast majority even of educated readers, it is much to be regretted that in the New Revision marginal notes of the most bare and bald description should state the presence or absence of a particular word, clause, verse, or even paragraph in some such form as this : "Many ancient authorities omit this" or "read thus." What can the ordinary Bible reader make of such annotations ? they are far too small to give anything like a necessary amount of information, and yet quite large enough to engender an army of doubts ; the almost certain danger is that many a precious passage, simply because it is not found in two or three MSS., will be relegated to the region of the apocryphal, and a general feeling of uncertainty will fall like a night-mist over the holy precincts of the Inspired Word.

To furnish examples which give rise to these gloomy forebodings I would instance St. Matt. vi. 14, which in the Authorised Version contains the doxology of the Lord's Prayer. You will have noticed that it is not found in the text of St. Luke's Gospel, and that in our Prayer-book, when the service is one of thanksgiving, the form given in the former Evangelist is followed, and when one of penitence or sorrow that in the latter. In the Revision it is removed from its familiar place. It may be well to tell you briefly the arguments to be advanced both for and against its insertion. In the three most ancient MSS. which contain the early part of St. Matthew the doxology is omitted, and the first MS. which has it is of the eighth or ninth century ; it is not found in the Latin Versions, and consequently is not mentioned by the Latin Fathers, but it is found in all later MSS. with very few and unimportant exceptions. Of all MSS. known, the majority in its favour would be something like twenty to one. The Syriac Version has it ; you will remember that this was the language which our Lord and His Apostles used, the language therefore in which the prayer was first dictated. The Greek Liturgies contain it also. I may add that this prayer, like the rest of the Sermon on the Mount, is composed according to the laws of Hebrew poetry, and the peculiar features of the Oriental style require its presence. I am bold to say the doxology must have been the composition of a Jew, and hence an interpolation of the passage after the Apostolic age is out of all question. The omission of so familiar, beautiful, and well-attested a portion of Scripture is much to be deplored and condemned.

In St. John i. 18, the Revisers seem to have acted upon a different system altogether in their choice of the reading; not only do the two oldest MSS. and the Syriac Version read "God the only begotten," where the Authorised Version has "the only begotten Son," but the Greek Fathers had that reading in the copies they used, as they comment on the words, and a trace of this reading is left in the Nicene Creed; the internal evidence is equally strong, as the clause winds up the paragraph which begins with the assertion of the Deity of the Word. This valuable testimony is, however, assigned to the margin with the usual brief notice. Again, take the concluding paragraph of the Gospel of St. Mark. It is printed with a wide space between the eighth and ninth verses, and a note is given that "the two oldest Greek MSS., and some other authorities omit verse nine to end," &c. Now, the case stands thus, out of the five oldest MSS. three have this passage, and both the Syriac and Latin translations contain it. Moreover, one of the two ancient MSS. has a space left as though something had been omitted, perhaps with a view of entering it afterwards. A note should either give a fair summary of facts or be silent altogether. A similar, but stronger note is placed against the opening paragraph of St. John viii. Only one of the most ancient family of MSS. has this passage; the most probable explanation of its omission in the others seem to be that these MSS. were made for public use in the assemblies of Christians, they were lectern or desk bibles. Now, at the time they were executed there was a prevalent prejudice in favour of celibacy as a counsel of perfection, and hence it was felt that a passage like this, which encouraged the hope of forgiveness of a mortal sin of a carnal kind would have an injurious effect upon the hearers; a very unworthy opinion it is true, but it will account very naturally for the omission of the passage from Bibles intended for public use.

Having furnished examples of *readings* selected to exhibit improvements and disimprovements, I would now call your attention to specimens of *translations*, dividing them into the same classes; for this purpose I shall for the most part refer you to texts with which you are all familiar. In Matt. xxiii. 24, "*strain out* a gnat" is a great improvement on the former *strain at*. It is very likely that "at" was an early misprint for *out*, or the translators might mean at every occasion when a gnat was found, but the true translation sets forth plainly the excessive care the Pharisees took to avoid defilement.

Matt. xxv. 8. The old marginal reading is introduced very properly into the text "our lamps *are going* out." This is the literal translation of the present tense; had the lamps already *gone out*, rekindling and not retrimming would have been required.

Luke ii. 10, "to all *the* people" instead of "to all people"—the article emphasizes the special people of God, that is Israel.

Luke xxiii. 15, "nothing worthy of death hath been done by him" is a much more satisfactory rendering than "nothing worthy of death is done *unto* him."

John x. 16, "One *flock* and one shepherd" is the true translation. It is difficult to understand how the former Revisers could have confused *fold* and *flock*, as the word *fold* occurs just before in this very verse.

Acts vii. 59, "calling upon *the Lord*;" the supplying *the Lord* is more suitable than *God*, as the prayer was directed to Jesus.

1 Cor. xv. 31, "I protest by that glorying in you which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord." This is a much clearer translation into our idiom of the objective use of the possessive pronoun, which is not unfrequent both in the Old and New Testaments than the literal and unintelligible rendering with which we are familiar, "I protest by your rejoicing which I have," &c.

2 Cor. v. 14, "If one died for all, then all *died*." This declares the death of Christ to be a representative act; when Christ died, we all died in Him. This is clearly the teaching of the passage, which is sadly obscured in the Authorised Version by "then all *were dead*" as though the doctrine in question were the universality of the fall instead of that of redemption. But we must forbear giving more examples of this class, and turn to some of which we cannot approve.

Matt. xi. 11, and Luke vii. 28. "He that is *but little* in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he," takes the place of "he that is *least*," &c. The original is an adjective in the comparative degree, the preceding clause speaks of John as having none greater, surely in such a juxtaposition this must be "less," not *least*, or *but little*. The true rendering and interpretation are found in some of the Greek Fathers, who understand by the "less in the kingdom" our Lord Himself, who came after John, but was preferred before him.

Matt. xx. 23. "But *it is for them* for whom it hath been prepared of My Father." The old rendering was felt to be unsatisfactory. "But *it shall be given to them* for whom," &c., but this is still more so. A new idea is introduced, and a new verb, *is*. The true rendering has no confusion in it, and is free from all detraction from the authority of Our Lord, "It is not Mine to give but *to them* for whom it is prepared," &c.

Rom. v. 1. "Being justified by faith let us have peace," &c. Admitting the reading here adopted, which for several reasons is uncertain, it would have been better to have rendered, "Let us being justified by faith have peace," &c.

Rom. ix. 3. We should have expected that the Revisers in dealing with this difficult text would have afforded readers some relief by rendering the verb literally "I was wishing," and not "I could

wish," and by placing a bracket at the beginning of the third verse and after "Christ," thus connecting "the sorrow and pain of heart" with "for my brethren," we should then not have an almost impossible utterance from the lips of St. Paul, but a reference to his sentiments in his old unconverted state, and hence the reason of his sympathy with his brethren because he was once in their condition of mind.

Gal. vi. 17: "I have *branded* on my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Surely the interpolation of "branded" is going too far. The word "marks" is used, it is true, for the brands made on slaves, but it is very doubtful whether that is the line of thought here. There are many who do not hold that the marks referred to were the scars received in the cause of the Gospel from the hands of persecutors, but that his partial blindness, which compelled him to write this autograph letter in very large characters, was the result of the dazzling light at his conversion, and so was a proof that he had seen the risen Lord, and consequently of his Calling and Apostleship, which they were inclined to deny.

Eph. iv. 13: "Unto a full-grown man." The figure surely is not a representation of the believer in himself, but the union of all in the perfect, mystic, Man, Christ and His members.

IV. Although we are aware that it was one of the rules laid down for the guidance of the Revisers that the style of the Authorised Version should be closely followed, nevertheless, we did expect that words that had grown quite antiquated and unintelligible to almost all readers would have been changed for their modern equivalents; we are therefore rather surprised to find *would* for *wished*, *wot* for *knew*, *which* where *who* would be the best English now-a-days; *Publicans* for Roman *tax-gatherers; Doctors* for *teachers; Rabbi* also stands in its Hebrew dress for *teacher; Raca* is left untranslated in the text, though *fool* is the rendering of *Moreh*—a very doubtful one, for if Raca is Syriac, so most likely is *Moreh*, which would have been better translated as *apostate* or *rebel*, *i.e.*, against God. *Good tidings* frequently represents the old word *Gospel*, and *to turn* has almost banished *to be converted* from the revised page.

V. These illustrations will serve, my dear brethren, to give you a slight, but only a slight, sketch of the work before us. I would conclude with a few practical remarks.

(1) The style of the Revision being in a decidedly scholarly vein, will be at all events some time in superseding the Old Version for public and general use, if indeed in its present shape it ever accomplishes that feat.

(2) Impress it on your minds that there is no small difficulty in giving a satisfactory translation from one tongue to another; there may be some changes approved by some and disliked by others; some may hail the work as a complete success, and others as a total failure; but only those who have experience of the real difficulty of conscientiously rendering a Book of Scripture into a modern tongue can sympathise with the toil of the translators, who not only had to contend with the difficulties presented to their individual minds, but with those that arose from their being a body corporate, where decision was arrived at by a majority.

(3) Remember, too, that this, as well as the Old Version, is the Word of God. Compare them together, nay, I would add, both with their original, and you will find no new doctrine, no new duty enforced, no old one cancelled. We must believe and do the same as before. This is, in short, no new Bible.

(4) The feeling of unsettlement may in some quarters prevail for a time, but further investigation, patient study, and consultation with experienced minds will soon allay the troubled waters.

(5) Lastly, let us never forget, whatever our private views of the Revision may be, that we ought to render to God the best of all that He has given us: the best scholarship and the deepest research in every age should be dedicated to His service and laid at the foot of the Cross, if so be we may expound more fully and faithfully that Word which is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

FRAUD AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

By the Rev. G. CHICHESTER SMYTHE, M.A., Rector of Carmoney, Belfast.

Sermon Preached at Trim, Co. Meath, on Sunday, July 10, 1881.

"And Ananias hearing these words fell down, and gave up the ghost: and great fear came on all them that heard these things."—Acts v. 5.

THIS chapter contains the record of a great crime, and of its equally great and appalling punishment. Familiar as all the facts of the case must be to each and every one of you, yet I would fain hope that a brief reconsideration of them this morning may not prove entirely without profit to our souls. For I think we have abundant proof in our daily experience of human life and conduct, that ofttimes the very plainest and simplest lessons of our faith seem to be those which are most readily, if unaccountably forgotten, and that, too, by some of those from whom we should least expect such failure. So I trust that none of you will refuse to give due attention to this subject, from the persuasion that it has no lesson for you, inasmuch as you are quite satisfied that your own spiritual condition is far too much advanced for you to need such a warning, or to profit by such teaching as the history of Ananias and Sapphira can afford. It may seem indeed to some of you as though one should suggest to an advanced

scholar that he should turn back to the first principles of his science, to the alphabet, as it were, again. And truly the lesson *is* very plain and simple; yet not, as I have intimated, on that account to be neglected. It is for our good, I think, to be reminded now and then at least, of the very first principles of our faith, even of a truth so plain and simple as this, that God abhors falsehood, hypocrisy, and fraud. For I fear that such things are not quite unknown even among all those who in this nineteenth century make a profession, and it may be a very loud profession, of Christianity; some of whom, indeed, would be prepared to discuss with you at any length the more abstruse and difficult doctrines of our faith. Now if the lesson of the passage we are considering be clear and plain—so plain that he who runneth may read it—let us show that we have read it by fleeing from those sins on which there is here set such a fearful token of the Almighty's wrath. Let us flee them in the form in which they may assault ourselves. For, while we shall not be tempted precisely as Ananias and Sapphira were tempted, yet tempted in some form or other by such sins assuredly we shall be.

Now first. It seems to be very instructive and suggestive to find such an event as this occurring so early in the history of the Church—does it not tell us very emphatically of the wickedness, as well as the deceitfulness of the human heart, when in the very first beginning of the Christian Dispensation men required to be taught that God is greatly to be feared as well as greatly to be loved, the danger being lest from the very greatness of the proofs He had given of His love for man, men should vainly presume upon that love. To have all the facts of this case clearly before us, you must look back to the concluding verses of the previous chapter, with which this narrative is closely connected, the comparatively modern division of the Books of the Bible into chapters, in this, as in many other places of our still Authorized Version, tending to break the connection, and so to obscure the sense. You will find at the end of the fourth chapter, a description of the condition of the Church most pleasing in every point of view. The special spiritual work which had been intrusted to them was being carried on with courage and success. In social intercourse there was perfect love and kindness. The multitude of believers are described as being of one heart and one soul. In relation to their temporal affairs, all their property was voluntarily thrown into a common fund or stock, from which each received daily according as he had need. This state of matters, pleasing as it is as a proof of Christian love, was of course only possible when the Church was few in numbers and confined to a single city, and which accordingly did not continue long in practice; and being economically unsound, is regarded by many as one cause at least of the poverty of the Christians at Jerusalem, of which we find such frequent mention at a late period of the history of the Church. However, during the continuance of this practice one person seems to have distinguished himself by more than ordinary liberality—Joses, a Levite, having land in Cyprus, sold it, and brought the money and laid it at the Apostles' feet. Probably the amount thus contributed by him was larger than that given by any other. The special mention of it would lead us so to suppose this at least; and also that he was held by the Apostles in high esteem for his unselfish liberality, witnessed and commemorated by the giving him the surname of Barnabas, which means the son of consolation; one, that is, who had himself received the full measure of Christian consolation, and who was therefore better qualified to minister it to others. Some consider the son of exhortation to be a better rendering; but in either case the name given him was a proof that he was held in special estimation by the Church. But as seems to me from the position which the account of Ananias and Sapphira, so closely following tha of Barnabas, holds in the history, they were moved with envy at the estimation in which he was held. They desired the praise of the Church, but they had not faith to exercise the self-denying liberality which would have entitled them to that praise. So they formed a plan which seemed well adapted to gain the end in view, which was at one and the same time to obtain the praise of men, and yet not too severely strain their own ingrained selfishness. They sold a possession, and, reserving part of the price for their own private use, laid the remainder at the Apostles' feet, deliberately stating that they gave the whole, and no doubt expecting the credit and applause which such an act of liberality naturally would obtain. But further, you will remark that so far as regarded the society, the Church of which they were members, this act of theirs was distinctly fraudulent. Others gave *all* they had, and were content to depend for their support on the daily distribution made from the common stock. And no doubt but that Ananias and Sapphira would have accepted that maintenance from the common stock, to which they had under the circumstances no just claim, as they had not performed the conditions with which the rest had voluntarily complied; so that it is possible that they might have so deceived their brethren as not merely to have won their applause, but to have made an actual gain of them. But be this as it may, supposing that they had even given far more than any others gave, yet their gifts could not be pleasing in the sight of God, because they had not first given themselves to Him. Therefore their gifts were polluted, an abomination in the sight of Him who regards not the amount of the gift, but the heart of the giver. We can only conjecture the precise motives which influenced Ananias and his wife. There was probably that mixture of motives

which makes the springs of human conduct often so perplexing. But from whatever motive the plan originated, they endeavoured, as you all well know, to carry it out by means of deliberate falsehood. Had they only had to deal with men, they would most probably have succeeded in their purpose, but they had to deal with the Holy Spirit of Truth, and with men whose hearts He filled. So hypocrisy and falsehood availed not for a moment. Their deceitful plan gained for them neither credit nor applause, but brought a fearfully sudden summons to death and judgment. So we have here first a most striking proof of the evil and danger of sin, an impressive warning that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God. I know not, indeed, but the thought may have presented itself to the minds of some of you that the punishment was too severe, that the display of vengeance was more signal than the guilt of the transgressors merited. Such an objection has certainly been made. It requires, however, but a very brief consideration of the nature of the offence, and of the circumstances of the case, to remove any such feeling from our minds. The sin itself was a compound of fraud, hypocrisy, and falsehood. It was an attempt to deceive their brethren, and shewed that in their hearts they thought they could deceive God as well. Nor was their sin the result of sudden temptation; it was a plan deliberately formed. They were not obliged in any way either to sell the land, or when it was sold to bring the price to the Apostles. St. Peter states that they were not under any obligation whatever in the matter. They might either have kept the land to themselves, or the price to themselves; but of course had they done so, they would have made no show, nor gained the applause which, as seems to me, they coveted. Therefore did Ananias form the plan of keeping back part of the price; he did it deliberately, for we are told that his wife was privy to the transaction. Therefore there was not in this case the excuse sometimes made for yielding to temptation, that it was the result of sudden impulse or surprise, an excuse of which Scripture seems to admit the force; but it was a striking manifestation of character, a proof that they had not been brought to God, nor could be. Just as the betrayal of our Lord by Judas was but the outcome of his natural character, so in the case now before us the love of money lay at the root of the evil. In neither case was there the possibility of repentance, because in both the final sin, great though in comparison with all that went before it may have been, was but the crowning act of wickedness long loved and cherished in the heart, the indelible proof of hopeless wickedness, the filling up of the measure of their iniquities. Now here, I think, we have a warning for ourselves. We know, or at least we ought to know, the weak points of our own character; we know the sin which does most easily beset us. But remember that that is no excuse for yielding, but a reason for redoubled caution. For if we find ourselves often failing on some particular point, or it may be even seeking occasion to gratify some special desire of our hearts, which yet we know to be wrong, let us reflect lest we be permitting our hearts to be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin beyond the possibility of repentance. In such a case there is not, nor can be, the excuse of sudden temptation. For previous falls ought to have put us on our guard. But if all such warnings be neglected, and the evil be permitted to grow unchecked, then it may be as in the case before us, that it shall culminate in some great sin followed by some great and startling punishment—a punishment which, though considered in relation to one single transgression merely, might seem excessive; in truth it is not so, because it is not the penalty exacted for one single act of disobedience, but the natural result of the deliberate choice of evil, and consequently of life-long sin. But what must further make us feel the enormity of the offence we are now considering is this, that it was committed by persons in the enjoyment of the very highest spiritual privileges. The time when this event occurred can not have been more than two or three years, probably not many months after our Lord's Ascension. There was then all the freshness, the earnestness of the first preaching of the Gospel. Ananias and Sapphira must have been baptized into the Christian Church, and therefore they had made a profession of Christian faith pledging them to a life of holiness. In the words of St. Paul they had "put on Christ." They had the advantage of daily prayer, of frequent, at least weekly, Communion, of energetic and powerful preaching, even from the Apostles themselves. Every association with their brethren must have carried with it some remembrance of our blessed Lord: of His works of mercy, His teaching, or His death upon the cross. All these taught purity, holiness, self-denial. The recollection of the recent miracle of Pentecost, and what they themselves had known of the mighty works performed by the Apostles, might and ought to have impressed their minds with the deep and serious feeling that they had to do with the Great Searcher of hearts. But all such and such-like thoughts were unable to repress the movements of one darling sin; all these blessings were insufficient to counteract the temptation of Satan; he emboldened their hearts to lie unto the Holy Ghost, persuading them that their object, whatever it was, might be attained by falsehood, and that their sin would not find them out. But this question will, I think, readily occur to you, what inducement led Ananias and Sapphira to become members of the Christian Church. Those were days when Christians were despised and persecuted. There were no external motives to bring men to Christ such as now make the profession of His name simply a matter of course. And

we can scarcely imagine that in their case the true influences were present, such as the sense of sin, and the deep conviction on their souls that Jesus Christ was the Lamb of God who came to take away the sins of the world. Nor can we imagine that they came in conscious hypocrisy, making a solemn profession at their baptism and yet not believing what they said. I suppose, however, the real answer is to be found in the deceitfulness of the human heart. There must have been love of holiness, or some admiration of the work and character of our Lord. But there was not such faith or trust in Him as would carry them victorious over strong temptation. What a warning to us to take good heed that our love wax not cold, that good impressions fade not from our minds, that we be not mere professors of the faith; but rooted, established, settled therein.

But further, we see how utterly useless for this purpose are all external advantages and the very highest means of grace if our own hearts be not right with God, if we have not the single eye, and simple mind. Rest not content therefore, with the possession of the means of grace, precious though they be; but most carefully see that in using them, you grow in grace thereby. Do not say for instance that you must be better, because you have a free and open Bible, than others for whom that book is well nigh sealed. There is in the hearts of some men a strong tendency to trust to their privileges rather than to the use they make of them. Thus the Jews of old were in the habit of boasting that they were the children of Abraham, as if that alone were sufficient to secure the favour of the Most High. But Holy Scripture most pointedly and emphatically condemns this notion. Our Lord showed the Jews that it was not the being of the seed of Abraham, but the doing of the works of Abraham that would make them accepted in the sight of God. St. Paul argues the same point at some length in the tenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, instancing the case of the Israelites who were brought out of Egypt, who were so highly favoured in the matter of spiritual privileges, and who yet were all overthrown in the wilderness, from whose fate he draws the lesson, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." And the case now before us assuredly gives us the same lesson, as we see how the very highest means of grace may become not only useless, but worse, nay, actually ruinous. It has moreover other lessons for us, some so plain as scarcely to require notice.

I need hardly point out to you for instance how it emphasizes the saying of the wise man, "That lying lips are an abomination unto the Lord." The duty of speaking the truth indeed is one on which a preacher scarcely likes to dwell. The supposition that anything else could be spoken by any member of a Christian congregation would be almost regarded as an insult. And yet, strange as it may be, all will admit that there is a great deal of falsehood and deceit in the world after all.

This suggests to us that we should carefully examine oursélves, and see if we be opposing and condemning all that is untrue, not only when it is used against us, but also when employed on behalf of the side or party we have espoused. It is not enough again that in our own case simple truth should be on our tongues. It is not enough that we should shrink, as I trust all would do, from stating what was directly false, but we must avoid even the slightest approach to misrepresentation or deceit.

Now there are some, and not a few persons, who do seem to me to commit an act of deceit, perhaps paltry in itself, and yet which is not so very unlike the sin of Ananias and Sapphira, which they would profess to hold in utter abhorrence. I refer to the way in which they speak—we have sons of consolation as of old—when asked for a subscription of what they are giving in charity, of the number of calls made upon them and so on—language in the lips of many quite true and right, but sometimes used by others in a manner designed and calculated to convey the impression that they are giving a much larger proportion of their means for God's service, and the aid of the poor, than in fact they are giving, *e.g.*—references to mite. Thus seeking either to cloke their covetousness, or gain praise for generosity to which they are not entitled, the very sin brought before us now. It is indeed a very small thing what judgment men may pass upon us, but it is a very great thing what judgment shall be passed on us by Him who knoweth the heart—in whose sight every piece of hypocrisy or deceit, be it small or great, is an utter abomination, a lie unto God.

But the lesson which before all others this sad event has been recorded to impress upon our minds is this, I have said that God is not only greatly to be loved but greatly to be feared. A true idea of the greatness of God's love would be of course the most powerful motive to make us serve Him. But a mistaken idea of it, such as that it resembles the fond indulgence of a foolish parent will assuredly lead to sin. There have been persons of such perverted minds as to argue or to act as though they might continue in sin because grace has abounded. Now at the time when this event occurred there was everything to tell men of God's love for our fallen race, and to tell it with all its power. It came with all the freshness of good news, even tidings of the great salvation, telling them to rejoice in the Lord. But when some who knew all these things, and professed to believe them, could be found so utterly to pervert the truth, as to dare to trifle with His holiness or presume upon His love—and this they must have done unless they imagined that it was possible to deceive Him—then was it time that a different lesson should be given, that

the divine Majesty should be vindicated before the eyes of men. Then must they be warned not to turn the grace of God into lasciviousness, or make His love an occasion or excuse for sin.

I need not dwell on the fearful form that lesson took, no marvel that great fear came upon all the Church, and upon as many as heard these things. May we in our day have grace to lay the lesson to our hearts. Amen.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 23, 1881.

WE continue to receive letters from esteemed subscribers on the important subject of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and regret that those which controvert our argument and denounce our conclusion as immoral and irreligious are marked "Private," because, however painful, this question ought to be fully considered by the Clergy. One says our Saviour would have cured syphilitic leprosy, but would not have tried to prevent it by giving women licenses to follow the trade of prostitution. Our Acts do nothing of the kind, but in many helpful ways say, "Go and sin no more." If we can believe the evidence of such men as the Rev. Thomas Tuffield, Congregational Minister, of Woolwich, the Rev. E. P. Grant, thirteen years Vicar of Portsmouth, the Rev. Prebendary Wilkinson, D.D., eleven years Vicar of St. Andrew's, Plymouth, they have been instrumental in reclaiming thousands of fallen women. Our objector adds: "My detestation of the Acts rests upon this, that they are evil means to attain a good end, and I don't believe in doing evil that good may come"—nor do we. We wish he had specified the "evil means" that he alludes to, for we hold that discouraging prostitution, restricting solicitation in the streets, closing brothels, reclaiming the fallen, healing and preventing a loathsome leprosy, are righteous means towards the blessed end of winning back the image of his Maker by fallen man. Our respected correspondent "C. P. R.", approaches the question in a more considerate, able, and temperate manner. We cordially agree with him that it is and ought to be considered and decided solely as a question of morals. As we said last week, health depends entirely upon morals: strict obedience to God's moral and physical laws will always, in course of four or five generations, secure strong physical health. Then again health reacts upon morals, as is evidenced by the superior morality of the stronger races of men. We hold that it is not a fact that immorality is fostered among men by a feeling of security engendered by the knowledge that these Acts are in operation. Men do not enter into any cold calculations in this matter. Immorality is ten thousand times more promoted by the solicitation in the streets, which all admit that these Acts repress. If our correspondent believes in continuous life, *i.e.*, that health and disease of body extends through several generations, and that health and strength promote morality better than disease and debility, he will perhaps see that it is a paramount duty to imitate our blessed Lord in healing and preventing all manner of diseases, in order that our race may thereby be assisted to regain the image of its Maker. Our contention is that by stamping out this modern leprosy we shall largely promote the moral and religious no less than the physical well-being of our countrymen.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NAME "CHRISTIAN."

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—On so very important a matter as my alleged rejection of the name of Christian, permit me to say that the term "rejection" does not convey an exactly true impression of the fact.

It is more true to say I have "dropped it," or "ceased to use it," than that I have "rejected" it. And this point of language is of the more importance when it is seen on what grounds I have ceased to call myself a Christian.

Those grounds are simply for the sake of honesty, and for the sake of accuracy. There are a considerable number of very good people who have quietly disposed of the essential dogmas of Christianity, such as the Deity of Jesus, His Incarnation, and the Scheme of Salvation, and who yet claim to be and to be called "Christians." If I did not laugh at them for this, I should seriously assail their integrity. But they mean well, and think they have the *right* to the Christian name. Now, I do *not* think they have the right to it, and thinking as I do, it would be dishonest in me if I were to claim to be a Christian. Honesty demands of me that I should not. In the next place, accuracy of speech and in the use of proper or distinctive names is above all things incumbent on those who would occupy any position as teachers of religion. And if a term like "Christian" has stood now for many centuries for those who hold in common certain beliefs as distinguished, *e.g.* from the Jewish or Mahommedan beliefs, it is a literary inaccuracy amounting to a fraud to take that term and apply it to one

who no longer holds those Christian beliefs. As well call a converted Jew a Jew and not a Christian after his baptism, as call a man a Christian after he has ceased to be one. I very much believe in God, and I believe in Him without the admixture of any of the doctrines distinctively Christian, and therefore I call myself a *Theist*, which is not only accurate, but is sufficiently received and stamped by literary use to convey a definite meaning. But I would have it understood that in ceasing to call myself a "Christian" I do not the less admire and emulate and long to practise all that is good and beautiful in Christian faith and morals. I reject consciously no truth whatever, nor anything that is lovely, and of good report. The Christian world, I think, is under no small obligation to me for not sailing under false colours and for not hampering their progress still further by a new and wanton ambiguity.

CHARLES VOYSEY.

P.S.—I have not entered into the question of the *origin* of my Theistic belief, raised by your reviewer; but there is much to be said to clear the ground on that point also.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

SIR,—I am fairly puzzled with regard to the Contagious Diseases Acts. The arguments *against* them —at least one—does appear strong, viz, this: that by these Acts we are really encouraging vice by making it safe. I don't know how to answer this; and yet I give full value to what you say and what I have heard from others on the subject—*e.g.*, the Rector (or Vicar) of Plymouth, Dr. Wilkinson, whom I once consulted on it, wrote most decisively in favour of the Acts, from his own experience at a port and garrison town such as Plymouth. I should like to see you grapple fully with the one serious—and *very* serious—argument against them. On mere *medical* grounds, I think you are clearly right. But the question is one of *morals*, as well as of sanitation, and I think that the advocates and opponents of these Acts always fight shy of each others' difficulties; it is like those combats of Condottieri in Italy long since, where the combatants took good care to avoid hitting or disabling each other, though in this instance not from the same motive, but simply because they do not know *how* to answer each others' difficulties. I saw enough of the mischief in the Army, when I was Local Army Chaplain, to be quite aware of the immense importance of stamping out the disease, *if it can be done without pandering to immorality.*

C. P. R.

CRITIQUE ON A PASSAGE OF SHAKESPEARE.

"By that sin" (ambition) "fell the angels; how can man then,
The image of his Maker, hope to win by 't."
Henry VIII. Act 3, *Sc.* 2.

If there be any doubt about the meaning of these lines, it is evidently caused by the words, "the image of his Maker." Omit these words, and there is no one but would take the passage to mean, "If the *angels* failed in their attempt to raise themselves higher than the Creator had placed them, and only brought ruin on themselves, how can man, who is lower and weaker than they, hope to succeed in any attempt to raise himself higher than the Creator has placed him?" Every one would have understood Shakespeare as assuming man to be a being *inferior* to the angels. But is this new element, "the image of his Maker," consistent with this interpretation of the passage? It certainly is not obviously so. Surely it ought if it were intended to strengthen or even to be in harmony with the above interpretation, to contain some description, or express some mark, of man's inferiority. But would any one attempt to describe man's inferiority by such words? Would any one ever venture to say, "Man is inferior to the angels, for he is only the image of his Maker?" May it not be that, with whatever idea Shakespeare began the passage, by the time he got to "man" he realized the fact that man is, through the Incarnation, more closely united to God, more truly stamped with the image of God, and so *higher* than the angels; and that, with his soul possessed with this thought, he wrote those words, "the image of his Maker," and so turned the meaning into a very different channel from that in which it would else have run? There is a tradition that it was through envy of man in this very matter of the Incarnation that the angels fell. According to that tradition the angels that fell (then, of course, unfallen), knowing that the Second Person of the Holy Trinity would take upon Him the nature of a creature inferior to themselves, and so raise that inferior creature above them, rebelled, and strove themselves to become as gods. But be that tradition worth what it may—whether it have that confirmation from Holy Scripture which some think it has, or not—all will be agreed that, through the Incarnation of our Lord, the lower has been made the higher. Man is, no doubt, the lower by nature. The angels, in their unfallen condition, were liker God than Adam was. Those angelic beings that have kept their first estate are both in their love to God, and in their love to God's creatures, as shown in their lowly adoration before God's throne, and in their ready ministrations of love to those to whom God sends them, much liker God than were ever our first parents in the garden of Eden. But through the wondrous mystery of the Incarnation, and Sacramental union with their Incarnate Lord, men may not only have the defaced image of God restored in its original perfection, but wrought into their being with truer and clearer impress. Man is raised above himself; lower than the angels by nature, he is made higher by grace: made partakers of the Divine nature through being made members of Christ's Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones, the children of men have a closer union with, and likeness to God, than it is possible for any creature, whose nature has not been taken into the Godhead, to have. So that, where this grace of the Incarnation works its perfect work, man is "the image of his Maker" in a higher degree, and truer sense, than it is possible to conceive the angels to be. He is indeed an object of envy to those who by nature are higher and greater than he. He is in a manner, through union with our Incarnate Lord, what they through wrong means strove to become. And so, we may paraphrase as follows:—'Be content with the place God has given you; strive not by wrong means to place yourself higher. The angels, the highest of all creatures by nature, through not being content, fell; they aimed at becoming as Gods and in so doing lost their first estate; let man then learn a lesson from them, and be content; though lower by nature he is higher by grace than the angels; he is indeed (so great has been God's grace to him), raised

to that high estate the angels wrongly sought; he is in Christ the very εἰκὼν of his Maker; let not him, then, who is so much higher than the angels by grace, though lower by nature, fall into their sin; he may forfeit, and lose utterly what he has by grace, and he cannot hope, with his weaker nature, to succeed where angels failed."

FRANCIS EXTON.

Reviews and Notices.

"Was Abraham a Christian?" By M. Ecclesia Chudleigh. Rivingtons. 1881. Pp. 103.

The title of this little book, when it first caught our eye in an advertisement, struck us as opening a new, if not very edifying, prospect for religious literature; for might it not be followed by a series of works propounding similar questions about other Old Testament worthies? Why not go on to ask, "Were the antediluvian patriarchs episcopalians? Was Esau an Arian? Was Job a Mahometan? Was David a Trinitarian? Were Isaiah and Micah millenarians?" and so on to any extent. The prospect thus suggested was certainly not pleasant, nor did it gain in attractiveness when we made acquaintance with the book; for in respect of bad English, broken down syntax, irrational inference, misuse of Scripture, and general muddle-headedness, it fairly beats everything that we have ever had the misfortune to come across in print. One consolation, however, remains—the utter and ignominious failure of the experiment must effectually prevent a repetition of it.

The object of the treatise is to prove that Abraham was "a Christian in the Bible estimation and signification of the word." One does not easily see what good would result, could the proof be established; for nothing would be added to our knowledge of Abraham, nor to the well-known meaning of the epithet Christian. But letting that pass, the proposition is absurd on the face of it. The word Christian never, of course, occurs in the Old Testament, and only three times in the New; and then it is not used by the faithful of themselves, but appears as an appellation, or nickname, bestowed on them by unbelievers, to distinguish them as the sect which professed to be disciples of the crucified Jesus. One might as well divide the twelve patriarchs into Whigs and Tories, as call Abraham a Christian in this, the Biblical, sense.

How then, it may be asked, could it ever have entered into any one's head to maintain such a thesis? The answer is instructive, as a warning to those who would rush into print on religious subjects with no qualifications beyond a certain hazy devoutness. It is plain enough whence the book has sprung. It rests on a single text, repeatedly quoted as the decisive authority for its assertion. "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named," writes St. Paul. There, we are told triumphantly, is the entire case. What is "the whole family" but the universal Church, consisting of all God's people from the beginning of the world? And it is named "of Christ," this whole family; therefore, every one belonging to it is rightly called a Christian. Not Abraham alone, but Moses and Job and David and all the prophets, nay, every righteous man even up to and including Adam himself; all were Christians together. Alas! here at least misfortunes do not come single; never was a greater concentration of blunders. As every well-informed student of the Bible knows, "the whole family" is a flagrant mistranslation; the name of our Lord is an unauthentic interpolation; and the "of whom" refers to the Father. In the Revised Version we get the passage correctly; "I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named." Not a syllable about the Old Testament saints being Christians! Thus the entire basis of the book crumbles to pieces at the first touch of knowledge. And in the same style the argument, if it can be so called, continues and ends. Here are a few specimens of what may be encountered. St. Paul's saying about the spiritual man, that "he himself is judged of no man," is quoted of God, and applied to warn off scholars from emending the text of Scripture. Abraham is declared to be a type of God, and Job an "inspired writer of the gospel truth of salvation through Jesus Christ;" and we are assured that "the holy men in the first dispensation looked for all the benefits of God the Father through the merits of Jesus Christ as we now do." Such statements come to a head in the astounding assertion that "Christ Himself administered, through the consecrated Melchizedek, His own precious body and blood to the faithful Abraham."

After this it is descending to trifles to criticise the literary merits of the book. A couple of extracts, which we hope the reader will understand better than we do, will be sufficient to give him an idea of the sort of English in which it is composed. The first is meant to point out what may be learnt from the first verse of the book of Job. "It opens in a singularly striking and decided description of who and what Job was, as if in a pre-ordeal examination and proof of verity a sentence of divine confutation was pronounced to all future and sceptical misapprehension of fact in truth that may be found if sought for." The other extract, from the very end of the book, is an attempt to give a final explanation of the word Christian, but seems to us to leave something still to be desired, at least in precision and clearness, considering especially that it is on the meaning of the word that the whole treatise turns. "The word Christian involves far more than a mere name: it is a principle, a substance, truth in credence, an incontrovertible postulate to be conceded, not by logical argument, but by unquestioning faith in God's word, whether in promise or fulfilment."

We are sorry to be obliged to write in this way about a book that is doubtless piously intended; but we cannot honestly say a word in its favour. Why, for the credit of Christianity, if not of the author, some discreet relative did not interfere to stop the publication of it, is a wonder to us. When religion is presented in such a shape to a world which is only too ready to scoff, she may well cry, "Save me from my friends."

The Rev. J. Knowles Harrison, jun., *quasi*-incumbent of Christ Church, West Hartlepool, son of the Rev. J. Knowles Harrison, vicar of St. Clement's, Barnsbury, N., has been appointed by the Bishop of Ripon to the vicarage of Dewsbury, Yorkshire.

On Tuesday, the 5th inst., a meeting was held at St. James's Lecture-hall, Sussex-gardens, for the purpose of presenting a testimonial to the Rev. Dr. F. S. May, who has held the curacy of Christ Church, Lancaster-gate, for twenty-two years. The vicar of Christ Church, the Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, presided, and, in presenting to Dr. May a cheque for £1,056, said :—"It was almost a truism that the mere pecuniary amount of a testimonial was no measure of its worth. But in this case he was sure the testimonial did not lack that moral element which made it so much the more valuable. They had been brought together by their good feeling and regard for Dr. May, and they thought it fitting to express their feelings in this tangible form. He hoped the occasion might be not only a pleasant one in Dr. May's memory, but that as long as his children lived they would recollect the expression of good wishes which accompanied this testimonial from so many friends." Dr. May thanked the meeting most heartily for such a token of kindness, which he feared he could not adequately acknowledge :—So substantial a present was an important addition to his pecuniary means, and he believed it was quite unprecedented. It was a testimonial in more senses that one. Looking at the names on the list, he saw they had originated in the congregation of which he had been curate, but those names were not limited to this neighbourhood. He thanked them for putting so favourable a construction on his life and conversation. It was said it takes seven years to know a man, and if after thrice seven years they still took a favourable view of him he could only say they were partial, and he on his side was very grateful. Wherever he might go and whatever might befall him, he should never cease to have an affection for this part of the metropolis." Among the subscribers to the testimonial are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Winchester, Lincoln and Dunedin, the Deans of Westminster and Lichfield, Archdeacons Hessey, Hunter, Emery, and Huxtable. Among the local clergy are the Rev. Daniel Moore, the Rev. G. Prescott, the Rev. A. D. Robinson, and the Rev. Dr. Robins. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is represented by Canon Bailey, the Rev. Erskine Clarke, the Rev. Dr. Kay, Mr. H. Cazenove, and the Rev. T. Darling; the Anglo-Continental Society by Lady Harriet Harvey, the Rev. L. Hogg, the Rev. J. Long, and others. Among the foreign Churches, the Armenian is represented by Mr. S. Apcar; Swedish by Dr. Grafström and Mr. Fröst; Danish by Archdeacon Fog and Provost Vahl.

The vicarage of Winkfield, vacant by the lamented death of Canon Elliott, was some time ago offered to, and we believe has now been accepted by, the Rev. John Daubeny, M.A., Exeter College, Oxon, formerly Precentor of Salisbury Cathedral, Chaplain to the late Bishop of Salisbury, and Principal of Salisbury Theological College. We may remark in this connection that this month's *Churchman*, in the article by the Rev. Daniel Moore, is in error in stating that higher preferment was never offered to the late Canon Elliott. It is true such preferment was never accepted, but that it was offered is equally certain. The instances of non-recognition of merit are too sadly numerous to be unnecessarily multiplied or added to in the simple rules of our ecclesiastical arithmetic. Mr. Daubeny is a higher Churchman, to use the cant phrase, than was Canon Elliott, but is not the man, we understand, to disquiet his people by sudden and unconsidered advances in ritual.—*John Bull.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Carson, Rev. Gustavus, perpetual curate of St. Augustine's, Everton.
Constable, Rev. Thomas, vicar of Holy Trinity, Highhurst Wood, Sussex.
Davidson, Rev. James, vicar of Christ Church, Chester ; vicar of St. Paul's, Portland-square, Bristol.
Drake, Rev. C. B., rector of Teversham, Cambs.
Eckersley, Rev. James, curate of Glossop ; vicar of Wednesbury.
Frith, Rev. James, vicar of Coalpit Heath ; rector of Alwington.
Gray, Rev. Ernest Angel, vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist, Woodley, Berks.
Harrison, Rev. James Knowles, perpetual curate of St. Mark, Dewsbury.
Hebert, Rev. Septimus, perpetual curate of Christ Church, Silloth.
Heigham, Rev. Arthur Linzee Chatterton, rector of Horringer-cum-Ickworth.
Hicks, Rev. Charles Hocking, vicar of Mundham-with-Seething annexed, Norfolk.
Hughes, Rev. David, vicar of Llanegryn.
Inge, Rev. F. G., curate of Alrewas, vicar of Elmton.
Joy, Rev. Frederick Walter, curate of Crakehall ; assistant-minor canon in Ely Cathedral.
Kahn, Rev. Joseph, vicar of Bishopstone, Sussex.
MacLeod, Rev. Donald John Forbes, rector of Shelve.
Maude, Rev. Charles Bulmer, perpetual curate of Wilnecote.
Meadows, Rev. John Brewster, vicar of Hoveton St. Peter and St. John annexed, Norfolk.
Murphy, Rev. Charles H., curate of St. Paul, Bedford ; assistant-minor canon in Ely Cathedral.
Neville, Rev. William, vicar of Watlington, Oxon.
Newton, Rev. Charles, perpetual curate of Quarnford.
Noyes, Rev. Robert J., curate of St. Peter's, Southborough, Tunbridge Wells ; incumbent of Fertagh, Ossory.
Page, Rev. Percival, vicar of Brinsley.
Riddle, Rev. Arthur John, assistant-chaplain at Cronstadt and St. Petersburg.
Rigby, Rev. George Henry, rector of Yardley, Hastings.
Robinson, Rev. William, incumbent of St. Clement, Greenheys.
Scott, Rev. Charles, vicar of Chertsey, Surrey ; surrogate.
Scott-Moncrieff, Rev. Canon, vicar of Christ Church, Bishopwearmouth ; rural dean of Wearmouth.
Scudamore, Rev. John Charles, rector of Ditchingham, Norfolk.
Stanley, Rev. John, rector of Stockbridge.
Stone, Rev. R. B., vicar of Thornaby, Stockton-on-Tees ; surrogate.
Streatfeild, Rev. William Champion, rector of Kingsworthy.
Talbot, Rev. Arthur Henry, curate of Stoke-on-Trent ; vicar of Lapley-with-Wheaton Aston.
Thomas, Rev. D. R., vicar of Meifod ; non-residentiary canon of Galfridi, Ruthin, in St. Asaph Cathedral.
Webb, Rev. William James, incumbent of Bradwell ; vicar of Alrewas.
White, Rev. Arthur, rector of Blaby ; rector of Parracombe.
Williams, Rev. Thomas, rector of Aston Clinton, Bucks.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baker, Rev. George, M.A., at Freshford, Somerset, on the 11th inst., aged 77.
Bruton, Rev. William, vicar of Sidlesham, suddenly, at Sidlesham, Chichester, on the 10th inst., aged 60.
Burney, Rev. Alexander D'Arblay, vicar of Berrow, at Witham Friary, Somerset, on the 16th inst., aged 42.
Cook, Rev. William, of Wimbledon, of decline, after years of patient suffering, on the 16th inst., aged 53.
Green, Rev. Eldred, vicar of All Saints', Cockermouth, at All Saints' Vicarage, on the 10th inst.
Harington, Rev. Edward Charles, chancellor and canon of the Cathedral, Exeter, at his residence, in the Close, on the 14th inst., aged 77.
Norton, Rev. William, rector of Pelham Parva, Hertfordshire, at the Midland Hotel, St. Pancras, on the 4th inst., aged 66.
Randolph, Rev. John, for many years rector of Sanderstead, at Sanderstead, on the 11th inst., aged 59.
Simpson, Rev. Samuel, M.A., late chaplain of St. Thomas, Douglas, Isle of Man, at Kingston House, Chester, on the 2nd inst., aged 78.
Torlesse, Rev. Charles Martin, vicar of Stoke-by-Nayland, Suffolk, on the 12th inst., aged 86.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FUNERAL SERMON FOR LORD HATHERLEY.

By CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. MARGARET'S, WESTMINSTER, ON SUNDAY, JULY 17TH, 1881.

"For he was a good man."—ACTS xi. 24.

"HE was a good man." What worthier eulogy than this could be offered to our departed friend? What worthier eulogy—what eulogy more to be longed for by ourselves—could be pronounced on any man who ever lived? When any man who has occupied a very high position passes away, it is natural to speak of him; and even when his faults may have been many, when there may have been no palpable evidence in the eyes of the world that he has lived up to the high moral and spiritual standard of the Christian life, when many evil things may be said of him, yet if, amid faults, he has had high and generous qualities,—if, amid possible errors of policy, he has still had the aims of a patriot,—if amid obvious failings some virtues have brightly shone, I think that every generous mind would then wish those who speak of him amid the general sorrow for his death, to

> Be to his faults a little blind,
> Be to his virtues ever kind.

By his open grave we judge of a man as we should ever desire to be judged—to have our evil manners writ in water, and our virtues, if we have had any (and who is so wretched as in all his life to have shewn no virtues, spoken no true words, done no generous deeds?), our virtues, or the nearest approach to them which we can shew, to be so mentioned as, if possible, to be of some help and encouragement to our fellow-men. So it has ever been my own wont to do; to look for the good, and not the evil, in the lives and characters of men, my brothers. If there be more or less of an evil spirit in most of us, there is an angel too; and, amid whatever weaknesses, we love to see all the good that this angel may have wrought. And yet of many men—nay of most men—I should hesitate to use without modification the text which I have chosen to-day. A man's goodness may have been unknown to the world; or it may have been mixed with large alloy; and if we speak of it without explanation we run the risk of being unreal—of encouraging a lax standard; of holding up a mistaken estimate. We may say of many from our hearts, "He was a great man; he was courageous; he was a patriot; he had a generous nature; he had many virtues"; but to say of a man outright, "He was a good man," is praise so high, that it is not often that any one would dare to use it in the pulpit. Nevertheless I do use it fearlessly to-day. Lord Hatherley has passed away from among us. We shall see no more that "good white head which all men knew," of one who has worshipped for forty or more years in this church; of one who almost to the last was a regular attendant at our early morning Communion; of one the cessation of whose regular, large, and cheerful beneficence will be a heavy loss to our poor. "When the ear heard him it blessed him, when the eye saw him it gave witness to him. The blessing of the perishing came upon him, and he caused the widow's heart to sing for joy." Even the secular press has said that such men as he—men who were pious in the best and fullest sense of the term, men brave without offence, distinguished without ambition, learned and weighty yet full of gracious virtues—that such men are the very salt of the earth; and that Lord Hatherley was worthy to be placed among those sweet and venerable figures. I venture, then, to pronounce over his grave this highest of all possible eulogies, "He was a good man"; for, while his goodness shone serene and beautiful before the world, in that stainless example, in that beautiful career, the eye of the world saw no vices to counterbalance that high praise.

I. It is a very solemn thought that, among the infinite diversities of men, there are yet, in the nature of things, and in the eye of God, but two classes of men—the good, and the bad. There are doubtless infinite gradations, by which the one class seems to shade into the other, and it may seem hard for us to decide respecting those who stand at the confines of the two. The fine gold may seem to be mingled with clay; or the base clay may seem, here and there, to show a gleam of gold. There are the Laodiceans of the religious life—seemingly neither very good nor very evil; the neutrals, neither cold nor hot, neither God's nor Satan's, fit neither for lowest hell nor for high heaven, whom Dante saw whirled round and round like the eddying leaves on the confines of the *Inferno*, following the sooty flag of Acheron. But in all mediæval pictures you will see men's souls being weighed in balances of justice; and in the fine balances of heaven's justice there is no such thing as perfect equilibrium. If the one scale dip deathfully, then, on the whole, our epitaph must be that stern and short one of the kings of Israel, "He did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord." And, oh, what an epitaph! how unspeakably shocking will it be, if God's final epitaph on us be, "He was a bad man"—*i.e.*, he did harm and not good; he left the world worse, and not better; he helped to poison, not to purify, the stream of life. God has given us but one life; full of boundless opportunities, while it lasts—and yet but one. Shall it end in

ruin? He has suffered us to make but one voyage; shall it close in shipwreck? Does it not so end with many? I say again in solemn warning,—

> Strange that, of all the wrecks upon the shore,
> And all that, helpless, drift about the sea,
> We never think that such our lives may be,
> Or shrink from life that may be one wreck more.

But the truth remains: men do fall into these two classes, good and evil, and the most awful of all questions for us is, To which do we belong? Of him who is gone we cannot have a moment's doubt. Of him we can sing unaltered the line which we have to alter in the case of most, of the hymn written by one of his friends, and a former Rector of this parish,—

> Brother, thou art gone before us, and thy saintly soul hath flown
> Where tears are wiped from every eye, and sorrow is unknown.

II. Again, there is this difference even between good men, that some have become good at a definite epoch of their lives, while others seem always to have been so. Some men, now good, were different once. They, as happened to St. Paul, and to Luther, and to John Bunyan, have been converted by some sobering calamity, by some sudden flash of conviction, by some astonishing self-revelation, by some bitter experience. The days of others, like those of Samuel, or of Timothy, or of St. Benedict, or of Wesley, have been "bound each to each by natural piety." Just as some ships come safe to haven with gentle and prosperous winds, because the hand of Reason has been firm on the helm, and the eye has been fixed on the compass of Conscience, so others reach the port indeed, but oh how shattered!

> How like a younker or a prodigal
> The scarfèd bark puts from her native bay,
> Hugged and embracëd by the strumpet wind:
> How like a prodigal does she return,
> With overweathered ribs and ragged sails,
> Lean, rent, and beggared by the strumpet wind!

And here again there is no question to which class our friend belonged. Even from a boy he lived the life pure, and strong, and diligent, and sweet; successful, and deserving to be successful; a blessing to his schoolfellows; the pride of his parents; no source of anxiety, but of perfect hope and honourable happiness, which shed new light upon the lives of all who loved him. He was one of those of whom the grace of God took early hold, and reason and religion ran together, like warp and woof, to weave the web of an exemplary life. From youth upwards he went on from strength to strength, until before the God of Gods he appeared in Zion.

III. Once more, even between men to whom has been accorded the inestimable blessing of being able to say "I thy servant fear God from my youth," there are differences. God casts the lot of some of them amid storms and tempests. The world hates them, as it hated their master, Christ. They find trouble and heaviness. They are confronted with calumny and opposition. They die in poverty or exile. Such was John Baptist, the worn eremite, ever in conflict, ever decreasing in fame, slain by the sword's flash in the hateful fortress; such was Paul, dying daily, made as the offscouring of the earth; such was Origen; and Savonarola, and Huss, Thomas Cranmer, and William Tyndale, John Milton, and George Whitfield, and such is many a living man. The holy and the noble life brings blessedness to all, but not to all happiness, nor has it saved some of God's noblest from being neglected, despised, shouted out of the world with execrations. But there are other men, not better but different, who are not called on to be prophets; who are not set in the forefront of the battle; to whom God in His great mercy grants not only a holy, but a happy,—not only a godly but a very prosperous and successful life. He gives them, not only His grace and blessing but also all other things—prosperity, wealth, freedom, from anxiety; a name beloved and honoured; no enemies; troops of friends. It seems as if God had so smoothed their pilgrim path, that they have no Slough of Despond, no Hill Difficulty, no Valley of the Shadow of Death. Such was Abraham, the pure and peaceful patriarch; such was St. John, the beloved disciple; such was Fra Angelico, the holy painter, painting his soft silent pictures in his pure and narrow cell; such was the Venerable Bede, living and dying in his quiet monastery at Yarrow; such was St. Thomas à Kempis, spending his untroubled days *in angellō cum libellō* (in a corner with a little book); such was the sweet poet George Herbert, in his parsonage at Bemerton, and John Keble, at Hursley; such, too, was our departed friend. His life flowed in calm and even tenour, chequered by no grave misfortune, gilded to the very last with gleams of joy. His one great bereavement happened to him only late in life, after years of unbroken and memorable domestic felicity. When the Queen wished him to stay at Windsor as Lord Chancellor he hesitated. Never for twenty-four hours had he been absent from the beloved partner of his years. His failure of sight did not come to him till he had honourably achieved the highest station which was open to his ambition. He presents the very rare spectacle of a life, passed in the open and unclouded sunshine of God's love, led into green pastures and by still waters. Successful from boyhood, unassailed even by envy, a day golden to its very close; setting as the sun sets, while he showed to the last a sublimer faith, a brighter hope, a kinder sympathy, a sweeter resignation. Very rare, very beautiful. I have never known such a life before. I never hope to see such a life again.

IV. And here do any of you sigh and say Such a life can never be mine! One says "I am not good. I have not won the victory; I am full of envy, and greed, and worldly ambition,—or of insincerity, and impurity, and discontent." And another says, "Woe is me! The early part of my

course was spent in making its long latter years securely miserable. My own youthful hand planted the weeds of vice and folly, amid which it now seems as if no good seed would grow." And yet another says with bitter envy, "I too should be good, if God would bless me. It is easy to be kind if one is praised and loved. It is easy to be virtuous on ten thousand a year; easy not to be personal, splenetic, base, sick to the heart of life, if one were not dragged down and fretted by mean disappointments and sordid cares." Ah my brethren, try to think otherwise of some of these things! If you have sinned, if you are at this moment bad and not good, what are these very words to you but (once more) your Saviour's call? It is not only needless, it is wicked to despair. "The Son of man hath power, even on earth, to forgive sins." You can yet die a holy man. And if this be so—as all Scripture tells you that it is—as Christ died that it should be—if repentance be still open to you in the place of your lost innocence, and with repentance peace, what more would you have? Do you think that it was these earthly gauds and trappings that made our lost friend happy and enviable? Oh, for shame! a Christian should know better. My friends, there are some elements of life—so transcendently the highest that there is no comparison between them and others—which are open, and open equally to us all. There are other elements of life such as rank, fortune, success, which are not. They are not the kind of prizes promised to the saints of God; not these, but things eternally more inestimable than these. You may be as happy on a workman's wages as on £10,000 a year; and in a humble shop, as if you were Lord High Chancellor of England. These things would have given to our friend as little happiness as they have given to not a few among his predecessors. Even as the air and sunshine, which are open to us all, are more precious than all gold and all power, so the gifts freely open to the very lowest and poorest of us, are as much more precious than worldly prosperity as the heaven is higher than the earth. A pure heart; a happy home; an innocent life; a firm faith; a sure hope; an unfeigned love to our fellowmen; needs it that you should be Lord Chancellor, and a rich man, to have these? Alas! there have been Lord Chancellors of England, and very rich men, with whom an honest ploughboy might blush to change his lot; and when our souls shall leave this dwelling,

> The glory of one fair and virtuous action
> Is more than all the scutcheons on our tombs
> Or silken banners over us.

V. And so, my friends, in this fair life which has ended do not look at the outward glitter, but at the pure gold. The reason why men loved and honoured him, was not because of his position, but because he was a good man—a true Christian and a perfect gentleman. Is it not in the power of every one of us to be this? Are we not all Christians? Are we not all called to be saints? Ah! believe me, to be a true Christian is infinitely more than to be a great man or a Prince. To be a Christian is not to wear a broad phylactery, or to blow a trumpet before us, or to do our righteousness to be seen of men, or to use a particular set of phrases, or to go about anathematising all opinions which are not our own. Our friend knew nothing of these methods. The pure gem of his love to God and man never bickered into these angry hues of party religionism. Whether he was high, or low, or broad, I know not. I only know that he was a Christian, and one of the best men I have ever known. And every one of us may, by God's grace become a true Christian. And the more we are Christians, the more, in the best and highest sense shall we be gentlemen. "It is virtue, gentlemen," says the heathen saint, "yea, virtue that maketh gentlemen." This rank, neither the whirling wheel of time can destroy, nor the deceitful cavillings of worldlings separate; neither sickness abate, nor time abolish. "Look," says the English poet,

> Look, he that is most virtuous alway,
> Prive and apert, and most intendeth aye
> To do the gentil dedès that he can,
> And take him for the greatest gentleman.

VI. But if we would learn something special from this fine example, of his many excellencies, I would single out two—his humility and his kindness. He was a man essentially humble; his rise in life, his wealth, his ability, did not make him look down on us who have none of these things. He had none of the strut and consequentiality and artificial condescension, of little greatness and small distinction. He had a large, genial, manly courtesy, which showed that he recognised in humanity the only dignity, and respected others as himself. He knew well that

> The rank is but the guinea stamp—
> The man's the gold for a' that.

And so far was he from religious or spiritual pride, so little did he value himself on his orthodoxy, on his goodness, that he once told me how he could not look into his own heart without deep humiliation; and that his sole trust and confidence was in his Saviour's atonement, and his Saviour's love. Ah, let us all learn from him that no diamond star, under which a mean heart may lurk, is one hundredth part so splendid or so beautiful, even in man's sight, as "the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God, of great price."

And then, lastly, consider his kind and simple faithfulness. He knew that a man cannot be kind by proxy, cannot delegate to others the duty of love to his neighbour; and so there was not a single good work about Westminster in which he did not share. When any good thing had to be done he was always the first person to whom I went. He and

Lady Hatherley were the first to welcome me as Rector to this parish. For myself, I shall always think of him, as he used to come year by year to our national school; and there in that back street, in that humble room, with no great gathering to welcome him, with no reporters present to praise his kindness and give publicity to his words, he would talk, like the simple humble Christian he was, to those little children of the poor who loved him and whom he loved. A Lord High Chancellor, and for forty years, till age prevented it, a Sunday-school teacher—what an example was this in a life so busy and so distinguished? Even the leading journal notices it as a prominent honour of his life. How many of you—how many even of you young men and young women—are showing this much self-denial? How many of you have the heart sufficiently free from selfishness and self-indulgence and egotism to be thus at leisure from itself? It does not take a lord or a rich man to be useful to the world; to be simple and humbly helpful in a parish; to deny ourselves for God's sake and the sake of others; to earn that which was the best and highest praise of the life of our friend. Yet how very rare are such, and consequently what a loss he is to this parish! With him we lose a large fraction of all that maintained our offertory and our charities, and a still larger fraction of that friendly and kindly sympathy which is beyond all price. The old friends pass away, with their generosity, their gentleness, their open-handed support of every good work, and, alas, it is not easy to supply their place. You cannot equal him in ability and high fortune. Will none of you, my friends, emulate him in things higher than these, even in the loftier and yet attainable greatness of unwearied well doing which shed even on his high fortune its brightest gleam.

One word more. I much desire that the memory of such a life should not be soon extinguished:—

> He's gone (says an old poet), and yet his glory still appears,
> Like to the memory of a well-spent life
> That's golden to the close, and when 'tis o'er
> Shines in the witnesses it leaves behind.

Yonder window was erected to the memory of his wife—the partner in all her blameless life—of his quiet faithfulness. I know that it gave him pleasure; I think that it would have given him pleasure to know that he would be commemorated by her side. Now he belonged to us—to this parish in which he worked—to this Church in which he worshipped for so many years. Ever since we established the early Sunday Communion, regularly, while health lasted, he was there, and the sovereign in the plate was a silent sign of his presence. Now I should like, by to-day's offertory, to erect to his memory, as the exclusive gift of this congregation, that small window of which the rays fall on the seat in which he habitually sat. It can be filled for £120, a sum which on many occasions this congregation has generously given. The memory of such a life is well worth preserving; we may never see such another. I cannot ask for any subscriptions, or take any further step than this. It will not interfere with any larger memorial. It will be your sole gift, if by to-day's offertory, or by sending to it unasked during the week you enable us to preserve to future generations a hallowed memory. Meanwhile, thanking God who has shown us the example of a life so pure and good, praying to God that we may have grace to follow this good example, I lay, as it were, upon his grave, humbly and gratefully, and in all simplicity, this shadow of a wreath of lilies in honour to the dead.

> Calm on the bosom of thy God,
> Fair spirit, rest thee now;
> E'en while with us thy footsteps trod
> His seal was on thy brow.
>
> Dust, to its narrow grave beneath;
> Soul to its home on high!
> They who have seen thy faith in death,
> No more may fear to die!

DAYS OF TROUBLE.

By the Rev. WILLIAM ALNWICK,
Incumbent of Mallerstang, Kirkby Stephen, Westmoreland.

Sermon Preached at Mallerstang.

"This day is a day of trouble."—Isaiah xxxvii. 3.

THE circumstances which led to Hezekiah's day of trouble and what really caused it, we are made fully acquainted with in the sixteenth and eighteenth chapters of the Second Book of the Kings. By a reference to these chapters we find that Ahaz, the father and immediate predecessor of Hezekiah on the throne of Judah, engaged himself, and virtually his successors, to pay tribute to the Kings of Assyria. Now such a state of vassalage Hezekiah no doubt rightly though hazardously declined to continue, and this is what is meant when it is said of him that "He rebelled against the King of Assyria and served him not." Any such refusal on the part of Hezekiah to acknowledge the despotic King of Assyria as his lord-paramount we may be sure would not be allowed to pass unchallenged, and hence Sennacherib's invasion of the kingdom of Judah in order to compel submission to what the King of Judah objected and declined to do. This is what constituted Hezekiah's day of trouble, and in this respect I venture to say that he but represents what has been the general experience of man, for there has probably never lived a man on the face of the earth whose lot it has not been to have some day or days of trouble and annoyance. Indeed, after reading what is stated in Holy Scripture, that "Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward," and taking into account what has been the experience of man in all past times, not to

mention present times, which have their full share of troubles, we cannot reasonably hope to entirely escape days of trouble of some kind or another. One of the great, perhaps the greatest, poet ever produced in England, speaks of "The heart-ache, and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to." And another has said that "The smoothest course of nature has its pains," and that "endless is the list of human ills, and sighs might sooner fail than cause to sigh." I believe that if it were possible to call up from their graves all past generations of men for the purpose of taking their testimony as to what they had found human life to be with respect to trouble, more or less probably not one out of the vast millions would be able to say that he had found human life in his case to be altogether exempt from trouble. As much as this, however, we gather from those whose testimonies on the subject have come down to us.

If then we cannot, and it is but too clear we cannot entertain a reasonable hope of any such thing as immunity from trouble, we can, however, endeavour to live and act so that our troubles may not be more than they need to be. It cannot be doubted, for I think it too evident to be doubted, that many bring much of trouble on themselves and subject themselves to many heart aches and heart burns, which they ought never to have known, and probably would not have known or experienced had a different course of conduct been pursued, a course perhaps pointed out to them by those gifted with greater wisdom, prudence, and foresight than they themselves were possessed of, but which by their obstinacy of will and unjustifiable determination to take their own way, they were led to reject, and thus to run headlong as it were into trouble, and in a case like this there is not only the trouble to battle with, but what is perhaps worse than the trouble itself, the remorseful upbraidings of conscience for having acted so foolish a part. It is not to be understood of course that any man is so foolish as to seek with deliberate intention to bring trouble upon himself, for there is no man perhaps but what by his actions contemplates and desires a very different result. But then it is not enough as we are all ready to admit, for a man to contemplate and desire what he considers a good result: he must also have good and solid reasons for believing that certain actions are fitted and adapted to secure the end he has in view, and where such reasons are wanting, where there is room to doubt, a man will certainly best show his wisdom by not doing what he may be strongly inclined to do. Now were it not that we find it to be otherwise, we should certainly expect to find every man carefully endeavouring so to live and act as to prevent any trouble finding its way into his life which really can be avoided. If it were possible to divide the troubles of men into two classes, those which are necessary and those which men bring upon themselves by living and acting out of harmony with the nature and constitution of things, and as if God had intended them to be a law unto themselves, we should find, I believe, those in the first class to be far from equal in number to those in the second class. It is sad to think so; but sad as it is, I fear, that the facts of the case could they be fully and accurately ascertained would not allow us to think otherwise. It can hardly be necessary for me to guard any one against misunderstanding what is here stated. We are not of course to think that because many and great troubles fall to the lot of a man, that he has necessarily acted foolishly, acted unwisely, acted in opposition to any law of God, either natural, religious, or spiritual. This was just the grievous mistake Job's friends fell into. When they saw the sad calamities and troubles which had come upon him they jumped to the rash and uncharitable conclusion that he had been guilty of some grievous sin against God, and so was responsible for his altered condition and circumstances. But it was not so. Job was the same man in his adversity as he had been in the days of prosperity. Against a similar mistake in accounting for the troubles that come upon men, we have need to be on our guard lest we be found charging them with what they have not been guilty of. Whilst we cannot but admit that many troubles owe their existence to perverted human conduct, still on the other hand we are bound to admit that many troubles exist which would not have existed could they have been prevented by a well ordered life and conduct. No doubt a man who lives such a life will escape many troubles which come upon others who do not so live; but still he cannot expect to be altogether free from troubles of some kind, for in this world the good as well as the wicked suffer. It is only in heaven that trouble will be a thing unknown, and where all tears will for ever be wiped away.

From what has now been said we cannot but see and feel the importance of being well prepared for days of trouble before we are made sensible of their presence with us. Come they will, as I have endeavoured to show; and this is but to say in effect that the present life is subject to sudden, great, and painful changes, and if we are wise enough to prepare ourselves for them their approach will be no surprise to us, and we shall be the better able to battle with them, and to turn that which is an evil in itself into a blessing, and so much help to us in our journey heavenward. There can be no doubt that troubles are often sent by a wise and gracious Providence for this very purpose, only men unfortunately do not always so regard them, and so miss the benefit they are intended to convey. We should certainly consider him not to to be a wise man who makes no preparation with a view to future emergencies, but rather should we regard him as chargeable with egregious folly, if he should argue or think that because his present

is bright and his circumstances all that can be desired, that it will always be so. I fear that reasoning like this is far from being uncommon. If a man's present is bright and sunny, and his circumstances pleasant and comfortable, let him by all means rejoice and thank God that it is so; but do not let him indulge the deceptive hope that he can live in a sphere where changes sweeping and disastrous are constantly taking place without himself experiencing more or less of change. Nothing in this world can last, and the truly wise will not be slow to recognise the fact and act upon it, so that when changes and troubles come they will be no surprise to them, but just what they had expected and prepared themselves for. It is no surprise to us to find that Jonah was so glad of the gourd which God caused to grow up to be a shadow over his head; but neither is it anything to excite our astonishment that the withering of the gourd should have caused so much grief and annoyance to him. He was not prepared for any such thing. It did not enter his mind that he might soon be deprived of that which he was so glad of and valued so highly. From this case alone we cannot fail to see the advantage it must be to us to be prepared for days of trouble, so that they may not come upon us unexpectedly, as they have come upon others, to their great disadvantage. I can see a difficulty in this matter of preparation for future events likely enough to be started by some. How, some will perhaps be inclined to ask, shall we prepare for that which is unknown to us? Would not our doing so be to make into a reality that which may turn out to be but a phantom after all? Let me say to such, that what has been may and doubtless will be again. What has happened to others will probably happen to us, and probability is sufficient for a wise man to base his conduct on, and not to act on evidence amounting to less than moral certainty would be to lay ourselves open to a just and well-deserved charge of folly. And it is a fact that no person can deny that many events cast their shadows before, and so give warning of their advent. He is a wise man that prepares himself for whatever may occur, and to such a man nothing can come amiss, and nothing, not even the most painful and trying events, will fail to yield him instruction and profit. Goodness such as God requires and commends is our best preparation for days of trouble, and having such goodness a man cannot well be unprepared for the developments of the future, whatever may be their nature, pleasant or otherwise.

It only now remains for me to make a few further remarks on how to deal with days of trouble when from being matters of prospect or future contingents, they have become translated into actual and stern facts. In dealing with such days we shall find much instruction and guidance afforded us by the example of Hezekiah in dealing with his day of trouble. As soon as Hezekiah became acquainted with the invasion of Sennacherib, we are told that he went into the house of the Lord, the sure resort of God's people in the time of distress, there in prayer to lay both his trouble and its cause before God, and at the same time he sent Eliakim and Shebna unto the prophet Isaiah to desire that man of God to lift up his prayer in behalf of the remnant that was left, meaning the two tribes of the kingdom of Judah, Israel having been already carried into captivity. We are informed what was the blessed result of this union of prayer on the part of the king and the prophet. The day of trouble was removed, and the sun, so to speak, which one day was shrouded in darkness, the next, shone forth bright and clear, every cloud being swept from the sky; for the angel of the Lord went forth during the night and slew the Assyrian army, so that Sennacherib departed and returned unto Nineveh, seeing it to be his best and wisest policy not to fight against the God of Judah's King. The course taken by the King of Judah in his day of trouble and distress, must, I am sure, commend itself to all who are found in similar circumstances by its marvellous success. Whether men believe it or not, it is a fact, in spite of the sneering scepticism of some people, that prayer is a really great power, and that as a means for the attainment of ends consistent with and approved by infinite wisdom and goodness, it will succeed when other means, such as men in their ignorance sometimes elect to employ as the best and fittest, utterly fail to reach the end aimed at.

> Prayer makes the darkened cloud withdraw;
> Prayer climbs the ladder Jacob saw,
> Gives exercise to faith and love,
> Brings every blessing from above.

It is surely not necessary, in the case of all godly souls at least, for me to say that this is no exaggeration of the power of prayer, no overdrawn description of its capabilities, but just what its achievements, which are matters of history, and which God, the source of unbounded power, has faithfully pledged Himself by promise to grant in answer to its due exercise, will most fully warrant and bear out. Many years ago a godly clergyman, illustrating the efficacy of prayer, related the case of a little boy with a sore hand, which had become so bad that the physician decided it must be amputated to save the boy's life. The day was fixed for the operation. On hearing this the little boy went to a retired spot in the garden, and fell on his knees and begged God for Jesus' sake to save his poor hand. The next day the physician came and examined the hand, when to the astonishment of all it was found to be so much better that amputation was unnecessary. The hand got quite well again, the little boy grew up to be a man, "and," continued the minister, holding up his right hand, "this hand can now be

shown to you as a proof that God does indeed answer prayer." Wonderful as is this instance of the power of prayer, instances even more wonderful abound in the Bible, so that those who doubt that prayer is a great and marvellous power for good, for the accomplishment of what otherwise is impossible, doubt both the Bible and what has been the blessed experience of tens of thousands of godly, but by no means fanatical, people. Now in days of trouble and anxiety, when there is darkness overhead and storms raging around us, it is no small comfort to know that whatever else we are not able to do, it is our unspeakable privilege to pray to God who is able to disperse the darkest cloud, and not only to still the most angry storm, but also to make it even the vehicle of the greatest blessings to us. This is no more than He has done in the past for those who trusted, loved, and served Him, and we know that He is not changed by the lapse of ages, though they change everything else as they roll on in their course. God is the same in His power as ever. His love for those who love Him is the same. He has done nothing for His people in the past that He is not now able and willing to do for them if only they will lift up prayer to Him in faith without doubting, or as the Apostle James puts it, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed." Let us remember this, and say with good John Newton—

> Begone unbelief, my Saviour is near,
> And for my relief will surely appear:
> By prayer let me wrestle, and He will perform,
> With Christ in the vessel I smile at the storm."

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1881.

LAST week, in a somewhat hurried and brief manner—too brief, perhaps, to be quite intelligible—we attempted to answer "C. P. R.'s" argument against the Contagious Diseases Acts, viz., that by their means we are really encouraging vice by making it safe. *A priori* this might be expected, but actual experience proves the contrary; immorality amongst men, as a fact, is not promoted by the knowledge that these Acts are in operation. The truth is that men do not enter into any cold calculations about the matter, but are suddenly tempted by solicitation in the streets, and this solicitation is greatly suppressed by the Acts. Our correspondent would not dream of urging this *à priori* argument in favour of the adulteration of food and drink in order to restrain other natural appetites of the body. Yet by parity of reason he and those who think with him ought to agitate for the repeal of the Adulteration of Food, &c., Act, because it encourages the vices of gluttony and drunkenness by making them comparatively safe. We also endeavoured to shew that by preventing and curing disease—especially a leprosy such as this, which cleaves to a man and his seed for generations—we were, according to the laws of inheritance, improving the muscular strength and health, and therewith the morals, of our race. May be that it was on account of the interdependence of health and morals that the Apostles were charged to "heal the sick, cleanse the lepers," as well as to "preach that the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Although we have admitted that the opponents of the Acts are "excellent, well-intentioned, and even sagacious people," we cannot concede to Mr. Moorsom that they alone occupy moral, constitutional, and scientific positions in the discussion. 1. We deny that the Acts intensify and render permanent the degradation of human beings. All the evidence proves the contrary, and at Windsor the subjected women themselves petitioned Parliament for the continuance and extension of the Acts. 2. Whether they are in direct contravention of the first principles of English Jurisprudence lawyers must decide: but we contend that they are not one whit more unjust and oppressive than our legislation against small-pox and dangerous trades; certainly they are not a tithe so harsh as the Mosaic Laws against lepers and prostitutes, which our Saviour "recognised." 3. The scientific facts, figures, and testimony in their favour are to us simply overwhelming. The Acts have diminished a horrible leprosy more than one-half amongst our soldiers and sailors, and considerably more amongst the poor-law patients of the civil population. Would that we could say as much for other sanitary legislation! Doubtless the success would have been much greater if they had been extended to the metropolis and all other large towns. Exceptional legislation has its objections, but in this case it was tentative and perhaps not indefensible. It is true that some half-dozen medical men of no great experience or standing in their profession have borne testimony against the Acts, but Mr. Moorsom is we believe wrong in stating that the Acts were introduced in ignorance, for they were recommended by a Royal Commission of able experts after a prolonged and exhaustive public inquiry. We are unaware of the grounds he has for saying that they are supported by sneers and by talking *de haut en bas*. Certainly this was not the case in Convocation this week, where we are truly glad to see that the subject is receiving careful attention.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—The Rev. R. B. Hull has forwarded me one of your letters to him *rè* the Contagious Diseases Acts. Would you be willing to insert a letter from me in your paper? I am not a clergyman, nor have I any claim to be called ecclesiastically-minded, but I know a little of the subject. The opponents of these Acts base their opposition upon three distinct grounds—moral, constitutional, and scientific.

(1.) Because they hold the moral law to be supreme, and that the moral law forbids such utter degradation of a special class of human beings as follows necessarily from the carrying out of these Acts. That these Acts recognise, intensify, and render permanent a degradation of one class, which has its rise in causes outside of the Acts.

(2.) That the Acts are utterly unconstitutional and unjust, and in direct contravention of the first principles of English jurisprudence.

(3) That the supposed facts upon which their supporters claim that they have decreased disease, do not prove any such position.

That facts taken over a lengthened period and a wide area distinctly prove that these Acts and all similar laws have failed in the diminution of disease, and have increased the evil habits, out of which disease springs. These positions must be met by counter facts and opposing arguments; the day for sneers and for talking *de haut en bas* has gone by. "These Acts were introduced into England in ignorance, they are maintained by ignorance, and it is ignorance that desires to extend them." Such ignorance can no longer be condoned on the part of those who profess to be leaders of public opinion; they must either inform themselves or else cease to agitate for the extension of laws which are by themselves confessed to be almost useless until extended to the civil population of the metropolis and the whole of our seaports and great centres; and when they cease to agitate for extension, their position becomes at once indefensible.

W. M. MOORSOM.

Lorne Villa, Clevedon, July 21, 1881.

SIR,—Is not the solution of "C. P. R.'s" doubt to be found in facts: the testimony of the best-informed being that the repressive Act, far from encouraging vice, is a deterrent? The only question I think worth asking is, whether it be not more compassionate—that is, Christ-like—to aim at rooting-out an insidious poison by the only means that are of tried efficacy, than to allow it to spread unchecked?

W. G. H.

SIR,—I am very glad that you have had the courage to bring this subject forward in your excellent paper. The statements in your leader for July 2 are startling beyond degree, and have no doubt opened the eyes of many of your readers as to the many ways in which this dire contagion may be spread. This is a matter which will have to be faced, and it should be done calmly. This Act is seeking to do really a noble work. And, instead of the clergy opposing it, they should encourage its being made applicable to the whole country. The fact that the innocent are exposed to this danger should be enough to arouse all Christian people to do what they can to "stamp out" the disease. This Act does not license prostitution, but stems it. A very strong objection to it is that only one sex is examined. But it should be remembered that those are examined who carry on the trade of vice. Of two evils, let us take the lesser. Legislation is necessary on this subject, and it should receive attention. Better have a few who make a trade of vice in a parish than have so many victims to seduction as we now have. The great difficulty in parish work is not only intemperance, but impurity. And this evil will not certainly be overcome by opposing this Act, but by encouraging it, or something like it. The Act may be abominable, but it is necessary for the present distress. As long as we act on our present lines, we shall not be able to save our young women from the temptations to which they are now exposed, and to which they so often sadly yield. This is a question for the whole community, and not for a class.

July 21, 1881. A PARISH PRIEST.

SIR,—I am at a loss to understand how any one who has given attention to the Contagious Diseases Acts can be unthankful for such truly philanthropical legislation. If your correspondents who object to the Act, and to public advocacy of it, had come into the world semi-imbeciles, or with defective limbs, or afflicted with cutaneous disease, and, although thus afflicted, were to complain that steps were taken by Government to avert such calamities from others yet unborn, they might claim to have their arguments considered; but surely every one who has received from God the priceless blessing of a sound mind in a sound body, and knows that through no sin of his own, but through that of either parent or forefather, he might have been an afflicted being, ought to feel most thankful, and to acknowledge that an enlightened Government exercises a just right in checking by every means so pernicious an evil.

July 21st, 1881. W. G. HAWTAYNE.

THE NAME "CHRISTIAN."

SIR,—As Mr. Voysey has in your issue of the 23rd inst. stated the grounds on which he rejects, or as he prefers to call it, drops the name of Christian, will you kindly allow me, as one of those "who have quietly disposed of such dogmas as the Deity of Jesus, His Incarnation, and the scheme of salvation," to say a few words with regard to the grounds on which I still claim the right to call myself a Christian?

My grounds are the same as those on which I consider that our Reformers were wrong in discarding the name of Catholic. My opinion is that their position would have been more in accordance with the truth of things had they changed their name to that of Anglo-Catholics, or perhaps even to that of Old Catholics.

No doubt the name Catholic at that time stood for those who held in common beliefs which the Reformers had ceased to regard as true, such as Mariolatry, the Infallibility of the Church, &c. But these were beliefs which had crept into Catholicism, and which were not essential to it. Catholicism had existed before ever they had entered into it, and will continue to exist after they have passed out of it. Now I maintain that the dogmas of the Deity of Jesus, His Incarnation, and the scheme of salvation as it is now understood,

are not essential to Christianity; that Christianity existed before ever these dogmas were included in it; for I hold that neither the doctrine of His Deity, His Incarnation, or the scheme of salvation were ever taught by the Founder of Christianity—Jesus Christ. I also maintain that the essentials of Christianity do not consist in these dogmas, but in those very things which are good and beautiful in faith and morals, which Mr. Voysey says that, though ceasing to call himself a Christian, he does not the less admire and emulate, and long to practise. In retaining these we are, in my opinion, retaining the essentials of Christianity. A CHRISTIAN THEIST.

THE REVISED VERSION.

SIR,—The Sermon giving an account of the various Translations of the Bible is, on the whole, very good: but the writer falls into a mistake for which others are responsible—those from whom he has borrowed his opinions. It is the assumption—without a particle of proof—that our Saviour and the Apostles spoke nothing but Aramaic. The extent to which Greek influence leavened Judæa with the Greek tongue is at once perceived when it is recollected that the Greek of the New Testament is a dialect of its own: not the same as the Alexandrian dialect of the Seventy, nor the same as the "common" dialect or the Macedonian. A dialect like this would not have been produced by a very few writers. It must have been the spoken dialect of a district.

There is an excellent book on the subject, by a Dr. Roberts, which I would recommend to those who may have been taken in by the uncritical assertions of writers like Renan. Of course it is of vast consequence in the appreciation of our Lord's discourses, to think we (probably) have His very words in the Greek. The few passages where Aramaic words are put into His mouth (notably two in St. Mark, besides the words on the cross from the 22nd Psalm) do not militate against the idea that He spoke Greek habitually, as well as Aramaic.

The assumption that neither He nor the Apostles knew Greek, or read it, is inconsistent with such a remarkable fact as this, that the Epistle of St. James, plainly an authentic document, is very good Greek,—indeed, the best in the New Testament after the Epistle to the Hebrews: and that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written to Jewish Christians (in Palestine) in its present form, and is not a translation, no man in his senses doubts.

Our Saviour, like other persons who are bilingual, would naturally use the more national language in moments of deepest feeling. But this does not prove He would use it throughout His teaching.

When Paul spoke in the Hebrew tongue to the multitude at Jerusalem, he did so to gain their more favourable hearing, and for a time he succeeded. But they would have understood him, had he spoken Greek.

C. P. REICHEL.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE ORGANISATION OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES:" being the Bampton Lectures for 1880. By Edwin Hatch, M.A. Rivingtons. 1881. Pp. xxviii. 216.

The aim of these lectures is to institute a critical inquiry into the process by which the Church of Christ acquired the organisation or polity which it was found to possess at the fall of the Western Empire. During its earliest or Apostolic period, the Church appears to have been little more than an unorganised aggregate of small independent societies of democratic type, without any definite constitution, or division of ranks, or fixed order of office and ministry; but by the time when the Empire fell, such a change had passed over its visible form that it had become a vast and definitely organised corporation, a united Church Catholic, with its three-fold ruling order of bishops, priests, and deacons, its subject laity, its dioceses and patriarchates, its synods and œcumenical councils. To ascertain the causes to which that immense change was due, and the steps through which it was brought about, is the task undertaken by the lecturer. How was it, he asks, that the almost formless communities of the primitive age grew up into the great spiritual empire of the fifth century? Was a definite constitution imposed on the company of believers by divine authority—by direct revelation from heaven—by "special interposition of that mysterious and extraordinary action of the divine volition, which, for want of a better term, we speak of as supernatural?" Or was the polity of the visible Church, its form and organisation, gradually moulded and developed by the existing and ordinary forces of human society, forces analogous to those which have produced other social institutions, only controlled in their action by the same divine Providence which sways alike the courses of the stars and the wayward wills of men? To put the problem in rather a different shape:—Was the organisation of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries so divinely ordained as to be an authoritative model, a binding law, for all time to come, the only form under which the Church can rightly exist, and Christianity be presented to the world? or was it the creation of circumstances, good for that age, but not necessarily good for all other ages, and open like other institutions to modification and readjustment under different conditions of society?

It will be seen at once that the question thus raised is a very wide and serious one, involving the character which belongs to Apostolical succession, episcopacy, holy orders, sacramental channels of grace, and ecclesiastical powers in general. As the Lecturer begins by remarking, it is a subject "which before now has divided kingdoms, and overthrown dynasties, and sent theologians to the stake." But his endeavour is to lay aside every theological consideration and doctrinal prepossession and to conduct his investigation by the approved methods of historical science, in the temper of the historian, and not of the dogmatist or ecclesiastic. To ascertain the environment of the infant Church, and the influences exerted by it on the formation of Christian institutions; to examine by the methods of modern critical research the early documents which indicate how the Church grew and was shaped, and by testing their validity and weighing their evidence to get at the real facts, regardless of the traditions and assumptions of later times; such is the resolve, such the plan, of the writer, be the outcome what it may. And to many the result will certainly be startling and paradoxical. The following passage from the close of the first lecture foreshadows the story to be disclosed:—"We shall see those to whom the Word of Life was preached gradually coalescing into societies. We shall see those societies organizing themselves as charitable associations in the midst

of great poverty and depression. We shall see them organizing themselves as disciplinary associations, held together by a strong moral law, in the midst of social disorder and laxity. We shall see them passing from a condition of oligarchy or democracy to that of virtual monarchy. We shall see the individual communities ultimately confederated together into a world-wide association. We shall see that world-wide association and its separate components recognized by the State, and trace the effect upon it of the close neighbourhood and the supporting arm of the civil power. We shall see its officers gradually formed into a class standing apart from the mass of the Christian community, invested with attributes of special sanctity, and living, or supposed to live, by a higher rule of life than that of those to whom they ministered." In short, the answer worked out to the question propounded is to this effect, that the Church's organization was of gradual and empirical growth, and was fashioned under divine Providence by the ordinary social forces of the age; and the inference drawn is that the Church's institutions and order are by no means of that immutable and obligatory character which would have attached to them had they been imposed from the first by supernatural guidance and authority, but are elastic and changeable, and may be expected to alter as times alter, and to "shape themselves in new forms to meet the new needs of men."

When the Church came into being—so the Lecturer's statement runs—society was full of guilds, whose affairs were managed by certain officials named *episcopi*. Each little community of believers became such a guild, of which the special and predominating character was that of a charitable fraternity; and the original episcopi or bishops, also called presbyters, were the officers charged with the administration of the charitable fund, the deacons acting under them as relieving officers. In process of time the exercise of discipline was entrusted to the same officials; and with this increase of importance came the elevation of one of the presbyters to the presidency or chairmanship of the official body, and the limitation to him of the title episcopus. Thus the organization acquired the form of a council of presbyters, with a bishop at their head, and a body of deacons who were the bishop's eyes and hands; the functions specially belonging to all these officials being those of almsgiving and discipline. And what we are particularly required to notice is, that the spiritual offices for which chiefly the bishops and presbyters were supposed in later times to exist, namely, the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, did not become permanently and exclusively attached to these functionaries till long after their rise within the Christian communities. The distinction between clergy and laity, we are told, was by no means primitive; preaching, baptizing, celebrating the Eucharist, enforcing discipline, were not functions belonging from the first exclusively to the officials; only little by little were the unofficial members excluded from the performance of ecclesiastical functions.

Such being Mr. Hatch's conception of the growth of the Church's organization, he must expect to be vehemently attacked from almost every side by angry ecclesiastics. Whoever believes that any form of Church polity is divinely appointed, whether it be Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, or Congregationalism, will rush to arms to combat the view that one and all are of human growth. Most indignant of all will be the priest, who claims the possession of supernatural power transmitted to him by imposition of hands in an unbroken succession from the Apostles; for on this theory the whole conception of such power, and such a mode of transmitting it, came into existence long after their time. Happily it is not Mr. Hatch's person, but only his book, that runs a chance of being torn to pieces; and we shall look curiously to see its fate, when its appeals to antiquity, its inferences and its arguments, have undergone the rigours of critical inquisition.

"A New Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew." By Edward Byron Nicholson, M.A. London: Kegan Paul and Co. 1881. Pp. xxxi., 267.

As every commentary is new at its first appearance, but soon ceases to be so, the adoption of the word "New" into the permanent title of the work before us attracts attention and challenges enquiry. The natural inference would be that what is meant is a *new kind* of commentary, a work laid out on original lines, and different in character and design from all its predecessors. That this is really the intention of the author his preface informs us. "I call this a *new* commentary," he says, "because it seems to me to differ from all general commentaries known to me in one or more of three points: 1. Its principle of absolute theological neutrality. 2. Its scope. 3. The method of its compilation." The last of these points of difference we may pass over as being of less interest to the reader than to the author; but the other two are noteworthy. The novelty of the scope is found in two features: "the prominence given to illustrations from Jewish sources, and the endeavour to set before the reader the most important corrections of the text adopted by modern editors, with a summary of the chief evidence for and against them." The novelty of the principle appears in the systematic exclusion of theological teaching and opinion of every kind. The commentary is strictly limited to textual and philological criticisms; from cover to cover there is not a single doctrinal or religious remark. So rigorously has this rule of neutrality been enforced on himself by the author, that it is impossible to infer from the book whether he believes the Gospel to be the production of one hand or of many, to relate history or legend, to be inspired or merely human. The sacred text is annotated just as a Greek play or a book of Herodotus might be, the avowed object being "to make it deserving of acceptance to students of the most diverse views."

Taking the work as thus purposely limited, we are much struck by the thoroughness with which critical obscurities or difficulties in the sacred narrative are treated. No pains have been spared to bring to bear on them every scrap of information and illustration that the author's research could discover, and the solutions which have been proposed by Biblical scholars are subjected to a close and impartial scrutiny. Independence, courage, and candour are stamped on every page. It is true that we are not edified in a religious sense, but that is not the author's purpose; on the other hand, there is nothing to offend, whether of illiberal prejudice or sceptical bias.

As specimens of the critical results we select the following. The three leading theories about the genealogies of our Lord in Matthew and Luke are minutely examined, and all are shown to be so full of difficulties that "it is hard to say which theory, as put

forth by its chief advocate, is the worst." Mr. Nicholson has none of his own to substitute for them ; and even when he asks, "Has it been suggested that Luke's line may be, strictly speaking, not a pedigree at all, but a copy from that part of a Bethlehem land-register which showed the successive owners of the property belonging to Joseph?" he guards himself by adding, "I am far from advocating such an explanation." But instead of giving a sceptical turn to the discussion, he candidly allows that "knowing as we do the difficulties to be met with in older Jewish pedigrees, and almost entirely ignorant as we are of the principles and phraseology of such pedigrees in the first century A.D., it would anyhow be unscientific to assume that these two are hopelessly irreconcileable."

Coming to the lists of the Apostles, he says that "Judas was a name as common among the Jews as William with us," and is inclined to believe that no less than three of the twelve bore that name ; viz., Judas of Kerioth, the traitor ; Judas the twin, *i.e.*, Thomas or Didymus ; and James's Judas, sometimes called Thaddæus or Lebbæus. While mentioning names we may add that he adopts the reading which gives Jesus as the proper name of Barabbas, the teacher's son ; a reading which lends a fearful emphasis to Pilate's question, "Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?" We may also note that he considers Matthew and Levi to be distinct persons, perhaps called by our Lord on the same day. The house at Capernaum in which the feast was made on that occasion he takes to be our Lord's house, and to be the same as that several times mentioned in connection with His visits to His own town.

Among minor points, we have the petition for bread in the Lord's Prayer translated, "Give us our morrow's bread to-day." The Baptist's "wild honey" is understood of the sweet exudation from trees and shrubs which the Arabs call manna. In the narrative of the Baptism of Christ the reading is adopted which makes the Spirit in the form of a dove, not *light upon* Him, but *enter into* Him. In the account of the feeding of the multitude, and again in that of the institution of the Eucharist, it is God, not the bread, that Jesus blesses. The adjective *aionios* is always rendered "of ages," with the remark that it may indicate either what is everlasting, or what extends through several future ages, and does not necessarily signify unlimited duration. Once more, the difficulty of our Lord's saying, that "the Son of man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," is relieved by the suggestion that the word used may have been the indefinite Aramaic word *Onah*, which is employed in the Talmud for fractions of days, as well as whole days. Three *Onahs* would be rabbinically equivalent to three days and three nights, and yet would really represent the fragment of Friday, the Saturday, and the Sunday morning.

We have space only to give a single instance of the many interesting illustrations gathered from Jewish sources. It refers to the Lord's saying that not a jot or tittle shall pass from the Law, and is taken from the Talmud. The book of Deuteronomy is represented to have fallen down before God, and complained that Solomon wanted to remove the letter *iod* from xvii. 17; a change which would nullify the prohibition against multiplying wives ; whereupon God answered, "Solomon and thousands like him shall perish, but not even an ornament of the *iod* shall pass away from the Law."

"THE SLING AND THE STONE." Vol. VIII. By the Rev. Charles Voysey. London : Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent-garden, W.C. ; and 30, South Frederick Street, Edinburgh.

In Volume VIII. of the "Sling and the Stone," Mr. Voysey still continues the task of slaying the Goliath of orthodoxy, the same giant to which we referred in our review of Vol. VII., in the "Pulpit" of August 30, 1879. Judging from the able and spirited manner in which the attack is conducted, Mr. Voysey has lost none of his relish for polemics. The book, before us, is on "The Paternoster." The author's preface tells us that "The recent appearance of the Revised Version of the New Testament renders the re-publication of these discourses more appropriate and timely. It may be that in learning from this volume what Theists believe, Christian readers will also gain a little light upon the better portion of their own belief." And Mr. Voysey is right ; for page after page contains what Christians heartily assent to. The 1st Chapter, on the Fatherhood of God, gives a striking picture of what the ideal earthly Father ought to be, showing how universal is the parental instinct, how unselfish is parental love. How inadequate is the term Fatherhood "to express the goodness and love of God." The last sentence in the chapter is worth quoting :—"And Him we only call Father, because no other name under heaven conveys so pure, so sublime an ideal of goodness and love. It is the best we know, and all our faith, and our reverence and our aspiration, impel us to call Him by that sacred, that endearing name, till He Himself shall reveal His truer and grander goodness, and unfold our faculties to behold and to adore it." Chapter II. contends that "All men are God's children," and there is a very *real sense* in which Orthodoxy can accept the statement.

Whether or not the name Father has been "defaced by Christian dogmas," and whether another name "has been set on the highest pinnacle of worship instead," is open to dispute. Not only here, but in several other places, Mr. Voysey vigorously assaults what he chooses to call Christianity, but his shafts are often in reality sent against some narrow, or distorted view of Christ's Religion, held by some insignificant portion of the Church. Because we pray to the Father *through Christ*, it does *not* follow that Christ is set *above* the Father. There are very few petitions in the Prayer Book addressed directly to the *Second* Person of the Holy Trinity. We emphatically deny what is called "The rivalry between God and Jesus." What Mr. Voysey says about Fatherly Rule being the most effective, "because Fatherly Law *touches the heart*" is excellent. Under the head of "*Daily Bread*" the old controversy is revived as to whether it is worth while, or even right, to pray for physical mercies. Both sides are fairly put, but the opinion of Mr. Voysey is decided, and shall be told in his own words, "For myself, I have long since given up in my private prayers the practice of asking God for any temporal good which I may desire." His reason seems to be that he is able to live in the seventh heaven of perfect trust ; "I so habitually rest in the assurance of His tender care, and feel ever so ready to take even the bitterest sorrow at His hands, that I no longer feel the necessity for the prayer "Give us this day our daily bread." It is consoling, however, to find that *weaker mortals* may if they like, still use those words :—"What I claim is, that those have a

right to pray thus who wish to do so." It is most kind of modest Mr. Voysey to allow us this privilege, having regard to our weakness.

Chapter VI. treats of forgiveness. In it, are several pages, touchingly written, on "Forgiveness most needed at Home." The author says: "it is a strange fact that people who really love one another, and who would grieve bitterly if death were to separate them, are nevertheless exposed most of all to interruptions of peace by offences given and taken." "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath," is the most perfect *antidote* to the little or great interruptions of our family peace." Again in Chapter VII. he shows how Temptation is needful to Virtue. The evidence for and against the new rendering "Deliver us from the *Evil One*," is most concisely put: and so is the evidence proving that much of the Lord's Prayer already existed when Christ was born. But the selection and arrangement of the petitions was entirely original.

Mr. Voysey is pleased to find that our Lord abstains from pointing to Himself as mediator, when giving us His Prayer. He forgets that Christ unfolded His mission as the disciples were able to bear it. One cannot read this VIIIth Number of "The Sling and the Stone" without admiring the talent, honesty, and eloquence of Mr. Voysey. He is a great loss to the Church: but his right place is clearly outside it.

The language he uses about our Saviour is painful to read, but none the less do we thank Mr. Voysey for courageously speaking out his views. The Mediator he hates is the Redeemer, Guide, and Friend of millions of men.

The *Tourists' Church Guide* for the present year, published under the authority of the English Church Union, yields the following results :—

	Daily Holy Com.	Vestments.	Eastward Position.	Candles on Altar.	Lights used at Holy Com.
1879...	123	273	1,259	990	479
1880...	128	287	1,369	1,091	506
1881...	138	318	1,582	1,194	543

The advowson of St. Leonard's, Bilston, has been placed by the inhabitants in the hands of trustees to negotiate for its sale, intending to devote the moiety of the purchase money to restoring the church, and the remainder to providing a public park. Mr. Edward Pugh, a local gentleman, has now offered £3,000 on condition that a portion of the money be applied for restoring the fabric and keeping it in repair, the balance to be invested, and the proceeds annually applied for the reduction of the rates.

Mr. Octavius Leefe, president of the Society for the Maintenance of the Faith, states that the society has been endowed with the patronage of two benefices, having acquired the perpetual right to present to the livings of St. Peter's, Havenstreet, in the Isle of Wight, and All Saints', Winterbourne Down, in the united diocese of Gloucester and Bristol. To the latter benefice the trustees of the society have recently presented the Rev. R. H. D. Acland-Troyte, who has been duly instituted thereto.

The Bishop of Durham recently consecrated the new church of St. Peter's, Jarrow, which has been built by the munificence of Mrs. and Mr. Drewitt, the former giving the site and the tower; and the latter the structure. His lordship in preaching from St. John xix. 30, "It is finished," referred to the translation which the Venerable Bede had made of this Gospel at Jarrow, and of which he dictated the last words with his dying breath. Proceeding to speak of the Revised Version, Bishop Lightfoot said :—"We witness here a phenomenon altogether without a parallel in the history of literature. The demand for it far outstrips any experience of the publishers, it far surpassed the sanguine expectation of the most sanguine. It is sold at every railway stall and canvassed in every newspaper, and yet it is not a novel, nor a sensational story; nor a book of travel or adventure, but an old, trite, well-worn book on which some time and patience have been bestowed to make it speak more clearly to English readers. What the ultimate view of this revision may be we know not. This is in God's hand, but if nothing else should come from it, was it not worth all the time and all the labour thus to stimulate, as it has stimulated, the reading of God's Word—thus to arouse the attention of the careless and indifferent, thus to gather crowds around this Book of books, as, more than three centuries ago, they were gathered at the first appearance of the English Bible, around the reader, reading from the copy chained to a desk in our great churches? May we not hope that some consciences will be pricked, some hearts will be stirred, some souls will be put right?"

The Archbishop of Canterbury has conferred the degree of Doctor in Divinity on the Rev. Joseph Bardsley, M.A., Rural Dean and Vicar of Bradford, Yorkshire, in consideration of his eminent services in connection with the London Diocesan Home Mission.

The *Manchester Guardian* says the Bishop of Madras has ordained Mr. Thomas Richards, who till recently was working as a miner at Collington, Cornwall, but who, by constant perseverance, had taught himself Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German, French, and Syriac. He is now devoting himself to educational work in Burmah.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Acland-Troyte, Rev. R. H. D., vicar of All Saints', Winterbourne Down.
Atkinson, Rev. Thomas, rector of Whiston.
Barnacle, Rev. Henry Glanville, to the District Chapelry of Christ Church, Gleadless.
Boyle, Very Rev. G. D., dean of Salisbury; precentor of Salisbury.
Ellis, Rev. Robert James, rector of Kirkby Knowle-with-Bagby.
Griffiths, Rev. F. W., formerly curate-in-charge of Sutton Benger; vicar of Coal Pit Heath.
Lucas, Rev. William, perpetual curate of Ottringham.
Roberts, Rev. T. N., curate of St. Stephen's, South Shields; vicar of Cornforth.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beridge, Rev. Basil, rector of Algarkirk, canon of Lincoln, at Coombe Bury, Kingston-on-Thames, on the 21st inst., aged 84.
Greswell, Rev. Richard, late fellow and tutor of Worcester College, Oxford, at 39, St. Giles', Oxford, on the 22nd inst., on his 81st birthday.
Hillyard, Rev. Walter, at Worleston Vicarage, Nantwich, on the 21st inst., aged 28.
Nash, Rev. Henry, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, at Bury House, Edmonton, after three days' illness, on the 24th inst., aged 38.
Ridgway, Rev. James, B.D., Lincoln College, and honorary canon of Christ Church, at Pontresina, Engadine, of gastric fever, on the 19th inst.
Wright, Rev. Harry, M.A., formerly of the H.E.I.C.S., and late of Cheltenham, at 1, Larkstone-villas, Ilfracombe, on the 13th inst., aged 68.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FUNERAL SERMON FOR DEAN STANLEY.

By the Very Rev. J. C. VAUGHAN, D.D.,
Dean of Llandaff, and Master of the Temple.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, July 24th, 1881.

"Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."—St. Matt. v. 8.

I OPEN the book where another closed it in this place one fortnight ago. I think that the words must have been in many minds these last days as they thought of him—"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

By his express desire I stand before you to-day—nothing less would have brought me here. Your sympathy will be a support to me—and I think also that I shall have the help of God.

It is the last thing that I can ever do for him; little did I ever think that I should have it to do—but his wish was generally my law. If, indeed, a funeral sermon were a funeral oration—if it were to be an eloquent panegyric or even an unqualified eulogium upon the dead—I could not have undertaken and he would not have chosen me to utter it. His reason was given—it was simple, it was intelligible, it was characteristic—"he has known me longest." Very touching is that reason in the memories it awakens; very suggestive also I feel it in the line to which it points me. "He has known me longest," and therefore he can speak the most real things about me; "he has known me longest," and therefore he can trace most truthfully the beginnings of that course, of which others know sufficiently the development, the progress, and the end.

When St. Paul wrote the words in his letter to the Galatians, "And they glorified God in me," he taught the Church of all time that it need not count it any disparagement of the supreme honour and majesty of the Author and Giver of all good to direct attention to the manifestations of His grace in the lives and characters of His servants. In this place—even more (if it were possible) than in commoner and less illustrious sanctuaries—should every word be silent which tends to divert the thoughts of the worshippers from Him in whose immediate presence they are. It may be difficult, but by His grace it is not impossible, so to speak of a child of man whom He has richly adorned with His gifts of nature or with His gifts of grace as to illustrate and not to obscure the Divine source and spring of all.

Tell me—shall I speak to you of this man in terms simple and natural, telling you what I knew of him? Will you pardon the commonness, for the reality, of my words, when the heart is very full, and the only thing it is capable of is to utter the thing that is there?

It is just more than half a century since I first looked upon that face, "as the face of an angel," which is now finally hidden from the sight of all the living. It was when I saw him enter the crowded school chapel at Rugby, radiant—his look showed it—with the joy of having just gained his first prize. The subject of that prize essay, "Sicily and its Revolutions," was characteristic, I have often thought since, of the master who set it, and, for the future of that boy of fourteen, prophetic. I knew afterwards, for I knew him not then, that the chief joy of that boyish triumph was, like all his joys, late and early, the joy of giving joy. His heart was at that moment in a distant pastoral home, the quiet rectory of Alderley, the scene of a two-and-thirty years parochial ministry, of which the world would have known nothing had it not been the fortune of the father to find an illustrious biographer in his son. Seven years later I witnessed his enthusiastic reception in the University Theatre at Oxford, when he recited his still-famous poem on the "Gipsies;" and I saw his father, then in the pause between his election and consecration as Bishop, bury his face in his hands, overcome by the acclamations which greeted the boy-student as he told of "an isle of palms amid a waste of sands," of the visit to it of "the Virgin Mother with her Babe Divine," and how

> —— the light of hidden Godhead smiled
> In the bright features of that Blessed Child.

There was in him, in those days, a receptivity of influences, scarcely, perhaps, intelligible to those who knew him only in his later days of independent command. But when, indeed, was there not in him that beautiful blending of the childlike clinging and the manly supporting, of the leaning upon advice and the giving counsel, of the demand for sympathy and the disdain of direction, which was one of the chief charms of his later and latest character? In that tumult of theological excitement which stirred the life of Oxford during his first residence, one and another of the leaders of thought and teaching affected him powerfully for a moment. But another and an earlier spell was upon him, and it was his life. The teaching of the Rugby Chapel and the Rugby Library had fallen upon congenial soil in the mind and heart of Arthur Stanley. That combination, so rare and so impressive, of boundless inquiry, independent induction, and intrepid utterance—of a rectitude which hated iniquity, and a faith which towered above the infidel—of a severity bordering on sternness, and an earnestness on vehemence, held in check, both of them, by a tenderness passing the love of woman, and a piety instinct with the love of

God—which made the character of Arnold a power unique and inimitable in the history of English education, fastened itself upon this one young disciple with a force and a tenacity which yet, in him, was destructive neither of individuality nor of grace nor of freedom. If the one was in many respects the hero schoolmaster, the other was in in every sense the hero scholar. They who have not seen his face as he drank in one of those brief, manly, original, often heart-stirring school sermons, have not seen that face at its most beautiful, most rapturous, or most inspired. No temptation of pleasure, no almost compulsion of illness, could make him an absentee from that joy and pride of his week. The sermon ended, he hastened back to his study—refusing, like the Prophet's servant hurrying to Shunem, company, salute, and question by the way; and there he wrote down, from loving memory, the thing heard—growing, week by week, in accuracy of reproduction, till it became almost the living transcript, by paragraph and sentence, of the whole. If it cannot quite be said that there never arose such a preacher, at least it may be asserted with truth that never had earthly preacher such a listener.

There came a time when it was given him to repay with interest to our great instructor the wages of his education. Forty years save one have now run their round since a sudden thrill of sorrow—such as this one in its sorrow, even more than this one in its suddenness—ran through the length and breadth of the land. That 12th day of June, 1842, lives still in the memory of some who hear me as the very saddest day of their lives. But what is it, let me ask you, that has made that a marked day for ever in the Calendar of England? What is it that has made that name, not a mere memory in the hearts of a generation or two of boys of one Public School, but a household word, a charm, a power, throughout hearts and homes without number on both sides of the Atlantic? It was quite possible so to have written the life of Arnold as that it should become first the quarrel of a year and then the oblivion of a century. It was the genius of Arthur Stanley which created the posthumous influence of Arnold, as it was the character of Arthur Stanley which gave to view the living work of Arnold in its most abiding form of beauty and virtue. It was given him to write, not indeed the first immortal biography, but the first of a new order of biographies, in which it is the one aim of the writer to stand out of the light of his subject—the art concealing the art, yet revealing, to such as can judge, the very highest art in doing so.

I cannot think that any service done subsequently to his country could eclipse this, the biography of Arnold, in its intrinsic and permanent value. Yet it would be great injustice to the beloved memory—for such and no more can it be to us hereafter—if we did not cherish fondly the remembrance of his later efforts, more especially in the elucidation and illumination of the Bible.

Vast differences there are and must be amongst us as to interpretation and doctrine. But I challenge reply to this one question—Do we not owe to him the realising vivifying touch which has given back to us, not as names and forms, but as things and as persons, whole characters and whole books of the Bible? And do we not owe to him, in a different department of his toil, the great and ever-recurring remembrance of the spirituality of the Gospel history—the footsteps, not to be localised below, but reverently followed above, of the risen and ascended God-Man?

It is natural for me—I regard it as my special office to-day—to dwell rather upon the earlier than upon the later portion of the life of my friend. Of the latter you can all speak—some of you more fully and with even more adequate appreciation than I. All hearts are retentive of that more public career upon which he entered when he was made the chief minister and custodian of this Abbey. The brilliancy of the position, as he made it—the hospitality of the home, as another beside him graced it—the multitude of his interests, reaching from the poorest alleys of Westminster to the very steps of the throne—the marvellous charm of his presence, uniting the simplicity of his nature with the ever-growing celebrity of his name, and the delight of his conversation with the recognised sanctity of his life. Of these things you have been witnesses—and also of the sorrowful overclouding of his happiness by the mysterious stroke of pining sickness, then by the stealthy advances of the last foe, till "the desire of his eyes" was taken away, and he brought her hither, amidst circumstances of honour and observance seldom paid to princes, and returned hence into the spoilt home to be for five more years, with whatever gleams and glimmers of the former prosperity, a bereaved and somewhat forlorn man—this, too, you have seen. And amidst all this you have seen him still diligently discharging his duties toward the Church and toward the world—notably to this Abbey and its grand memories—adding to, rather than diminishing from his great toils, his wonderful activities—seeking ever to make men feel that there is a Christianity larger even than Churchmanship, and to keep within the pale of worshipping some who cannot see with us each particular even of revelation—thinking ever how to make this building more and more a visible sample and specimen of the Church indeed Catholic—how to make it more accessible, more attractive, more instructive, more monitory, to the working men, and to the weary women, and to the little children, of London and of England—caring for the poor more and more, caring for the sorrowful more and more, caring for the sick and the stricken more and more, as he himself learned by experience more

of sympathy, and felt himself more at home, than in days of unclouded splendour, with those on whom the hand of God lies heavily and imperiously for suffering.

Thus passed the remaining years of that life of which we fondly hoped that we had not even yet entered the last decade. There seemed to be so much for him still to look upon, still to sympathise with, in some measure still to enjoy: his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated: save at exceptional moments there was still much of the old interest, much of the old fire, all the old virtue, more (to our eyes) even than the old beauty. Still could he kindle into indignation at the first suspicion of a wrong, still could he sparkle into exultation at the first mention of a heroism. We who saw him oftenest never associated with him the idea of decay: we might try to contemplate for him the last end, but the thought eluded us again when we marked the quick step, heard the joyous laugh, or elicited some fresh evidence of the bright imagination, the clear judgment, the unfaltering memory.

"In the midst of life we are in death." By a course so rapid that ten days spanned the whole of it—with vicissitudes so quick that we passed in a few hours from anxiety to hope, from hope to despair—he has gone whither we cannot follow him now, save in tender love and in undying remembrance.

Those latest morning and evening hours, separated from each other by an interval of what we felt at the time to be almost fictitious hope—that early Communion, closed by the Benediction from his own faltering yet resolute lips—then that solemn vigil, as the strength gradually but speedily spent itself, and there came at last a silence that might be heard, as we listened for the possible breath that came not again—these were the closing scenes of the pathetic and beautiful life. Will a later generation—this generation cannot—will a later generation—we ask, and we cannot answer—see its like again?

No—not its like—certainly, or almost certainly, not its like—but one, perhaps, which shall do with equal efficiency one little fragment more of that whole work of God of which it is given to no one life to do more than that little.

Spots and blemishes, no doubt, may be found in this dear and lovely life. It was a life which at certain times challenged, perhaps provoked, opposition. Its very virtues ran sometimes into pugnacities: where opposition, where injustice was suspected, the balance of the judgment was not always, perhaps, quite impartial. But these things are transitory, and die with the death: the good shall live after him. Where again shall we see that courage, that intrepidity, that defiance of odds, in the cause thought to be justice? where that persistent championship of a friend thought to be injured? where that tenacity of friendship itself, never flattering, always true—yet loving still, loving to the end, though with few professions on the one side, and in spite, perhaps, of many faults on the other?

We are all the poorer for this death, and we must die so. Many who knew him not say that they feel the world itself poorer since that midnight of the 18th. This Abbey looks to-day more weird and ghost-like—the only life seems to have gone out of it. It has become to us a mere mausoleum, with one precious corpse to-morrow to be added. We cannot help it. It must be so. Men like that must be missed, ought to be missed, when they are gone. "He was not found," it is written of one of them—men looked for him, in his tent and in his chamber, and "he was not found, for God had translated him."

Most men of mark have some one characteristic: in this case I think that the text touches it. We might call it by more than one name. That absolute naturalness, that transparent sincerity, that perfect disinterestedness, that destitution of vanity, that indifference to admiration, that superiority to obloquy, that perfect truthfulness—robbed of half its sting, even when it reproved, by the knowledge that it could not but speak the thing which it felt and knew—combine these qualities, trace them to their source, and we shall find it here—in that grace of simplicity—simplicity in its original and grand sense of singleness—given to him in a measure beyond that which we have ever been conscious of in any other. Trace this same grace yet (if it be possible) one step higher, and we come to that pureness or cleanness of the heart of which the sixth Beatitude tells. "I have not known amongst men," one sorrowing letter says of him, "so white a soul, so single a heart." The courage was wonderful, and the independence, and the generosity, and the industry, and the versatility, and the forgivingness, and the genius—but, after all, I question if the net result of the life will not be this one particular—"Blessed are the pure in heart." I, who have "known him longest"—I, who for half a century have been his companion, his confidant, his friend, at last his brother—can say this of him, as I lay him in his grave to-morrow, Never, never, never, did I know him other than pure. It is no irreverence to apply to him, with all due allowance for humanity and for the Fall, words written in prophecy of the Saviour to whom he is gone, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity—wherefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

There is a bewilderment in great sorrow. Like the brothers in the undying story, we look one upon another, and say, "What is this which God hath done unto us?" We think over the lost life, we count up the many virtues, we feel the gap made by the death, we feebly wish ourselves this and that which he was; and then we go back to

our work and to our labour, made less strong for it and less brave by the very fact that he can no longer be at our side to cheer us in it by voice and presence, by sympathy and by example. Thus we lose the true "comfort," the fortifying and the cheering on, which lies somewhere in every sorrow for such as have the secret.

Surely we shall place this foremost among our lessons to-day, that this beautiful life, cut short here in its grace and in its blessing, cannot really be ended, must be still growing and expanding, still learning and still loving, somewhere out of sight of the living. He himself felt sometimes, in his later years, the incompleteness of his own career, measured by the result, measured by the performance. He had reached that point, under the discipline of many chequered experiences and of a few great sorrows, at which a man begins to ask himself, "Is this all? Is it for this that I have come all this way, that I have laboured all these years and not fainted—for this small amount of success in acting upon the thoughts and habits of my generation?" You must remember, too, that to him each experience of misconduct or unsoundness in others, each victory of what he counted prejudice or bigotry or passion, was felt as a grief and a burden laid upon himself, perceptibly acting upon his health and spirits, diminishing his stock of life, and affecting him as other men are affected by a fever or an accident. Can it be, then, we ask ourselves, that the life of a good man must be a failure on the whole, taking into view all time and all being, in proportion as he has been more entirely and absolutely on the side of good? Must there not be somewhere out of sight a compensating existence, a home indeed of many mansions, in which faculties and energies, straitened here in their beneficent action, shall find their full scope, and their perpetual progress towards perfection? The gentler the spirit, the tenderer the conscience, the more lovely and loving the life, the stronger is the argument, from its very defeat and discomfiture here, for its immortality in a state of which sight and sense give no demonstration. No waste was ever more wanton, and therefore, under a God of wisdom and judgment, more inconceivable, than that which would be if Arthur Stanley has perished.

There is another thought to which I must try to give utterance. I think now not of the life which is beyond death, but of that life which leads up to it. If there was one thing which lay at the very heart of this man, it was the seriousness of life. All that was cheerful and beautiful and natural, all that stirred the interest and cultivated the taste and charmed the imagination, he not only approved, he shared in to the uttermost. But frivolity, giddiness, vanity, levity in all its forms, was distasteful, was odious to him from his boyhood. Like all true men, he was capable of an indignation which was withering and consuming to evil. To stand before him with a lie in the right hand would have been impossible. It was this which gave him no small power over natures not constitutionally akin to him. Where he was, there could not be impurity, there could not be impiety, there could not be folly. In his relaxation there was purpose—in his merriment there was wisdom. If anywhere that voice, that presence, that companionship will be missed on earth for blessing, it will be where young men and maidens, where health and life and cheerfulness, are the bystanders, the observers, and the listeners. There will be the blank and the void and the chasm, where there is no longer one to show the innocent lightheartedness of the good—how it can instruct while it delights, elevate while it charms, and inspire while it inspirits.

Brethren and sisters, mourners with one another and with us under the pressure of a very great sorrow, let us all lay to heart one last lesson. They who stood last Monday in that chamber, by that bedside of the dying, must have been struck by one thing—the separateness, even before the last stroke, of the staying and the departing. Words were essayed by those lips which not the most eager and loving attention could make intelligible to the hearer. Too late then to say the thing that had till then been left unsaid—whether the word of comfort, or the word of counsel, or the word of faith. Too late, how much more, to settle then one ambiguous question, or to lay anew one foundation-stone of the everlasting hope. Sickness has its own preoccupations, and they engross such energies as are left to it. A few prayers and hymns, chosen on a peradventure, and languidly or drowsily listened to—a few farewells, brief and indistinct—and the soul has passed across an unseen frontier, into the land that is indeed at such moments very far off. O leave not for that last day anything that is material! Settle with yourselves, long ere that last day comes, every practical question which concerns immortality. Settle with yourselves, at all events, this one question—practical it is, vital it is, conscience being the judge—what your faith is—what its ground, and what your hold upon it. If you feel that life has not been spotless, or that, perhaps, the spotlessness of earth may not be (at its best) the purity of heaven, see whether there be not, as an old Book says, One who has undertaken for you, One who, in a sense as substantial as it is mysterious, has borne your sins and carried your sorrows, a Saviour at once desirable, necessary, and sufficient for you. If such there be, give yourself no rest till you have found Him—till you are able at least to cry, in the sweet words of him we mourn to-day—

> O remember, Saviour dear,
> What the cause that brought Thee here!
> Thou to save my soul has borne
> Cross and grief, and hate and scorn—
> O may all that toil and pain
> Not be wholly spent in vain!

SPIRITUAL WORSHIP.

By the Rev. H. C. MITCHINSON, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Rotherhithe.

Sermon Preached at St. Matthew's, Denmark Hill, on Sunday Morning, July 10th, 1881.

"Jesus saith, Woman, believe Me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit: and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."—St. John iv. 21, 23, 24.

OUR Lord is here talking to the Samaritan woman. He had touched her conscience in its tender point—for He had told her she was living in adultery—and she felt, if she did not say, according to the language of one of her country's kings, "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy"? By a dexterous shift, she starts a controversial point—thus seeking to escape the heart-probing of our Lord—and puts before Him a question as to the conflicting claims of the Samaritan and Jewish worship and religion (v. 20). In verse 22, having indicated the superior claims of Jerusalem and Sion over Samaria and Gerizim, our Lord proceeds in the verses of my text to announce truths of world-wide, universal, unchangeable interest as to the worship of God (vv. 21, 23, 24).

I. Enquire what this passage does not mean. II. Enquire what it does.

I. Enquire what the passage does not mean.

(1) When our Lord said, "Believe Me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father," He did not mean we are not to set apart places for and times of worship. This would be to contradict the practice and precept of both our Lord and His Apostles. We have our Lord's example, who, "as His custom was, went into the synagogue every Sabbath day." Or if it be thought His example is not to the point, and that the expression "The hour cometh, and now is," pointed to the time following His Ascension and the sending down of the Holy Ghost, His promise at any rate must be allowed to extend to that time, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." And after His Ascension, when the hour He spoke of had fully come, and the Christian Dispensation was in its completed state, we have the members of that Early Church "continuing daily with one accord in the Temple," for ordinary worship—for it had ceased to be for them the place of sacrifice; and "Peter and John going together into the Temple at the hour of prayer"; and we have members of the Church gathered in the house of Mary, the mother of Mark, and "prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God for Peter"; and on the first day of the week, when the disciples were assembled, Paul preached to them on the occasion of Eutychus' accident. And passing from Apostolic practice to statements and precepts, we find Paul speaking to the Corinthians about "coming together in the church, into one place," and reproaching them for using such place for a meal, when they had ordinary "houses to eat and drink in;" and exhorting Hebrew Christians "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together."

What our Lord meant, then, was not that there were to be no places of worship, but that worship would no longer be confined to one place, as it had been; for much of it, in the case of the Jew, was only possible in the Temple. That there was to be freedom, universality; that while we ought to worship in the sanctuary, we may worship anywhere; that while the sacrifice which prefigured the Atonement could only be offered in the Jewish Temple, the Lord's Supper, which commemorates it, may be administered in any Christian place of assembly, or if needs be, the private home or sick chamber; and that if providentially cut off from the place of public ordinances, like John at Patmos, we may be "in the spirit on the Lord's day"; and "if," as Matthew Henry expresses it, "we cannot go to the house of the Lord, we can to the Lord of the house."

(2) Again, when our Lord said, "They who worship the Father must worship Him in *spirit*," He did not intend to teach that we should not worship with the body; reason, Scripture, our Lord's example, all prove He meant not this. Reason: For inward feeling demands to be allowed some outward manifestation, and so close is the connexion between soul and body, that where there is inward worship, it is almost impossible there should not be corresponding outward demeanour; the urgency of the spirit seeks vent through the members, as aged Jacob, though it was the moment of dissolution, and he was stretched in weakness on his dying bed, and nature was failing, "yet worshipped, bowing himself on the bed's head." Scripture, too, tells us to glorify God in our *body* and our spirit. And our Lord's example includes the worship of body as well as spirit; for He lifted up His eyes when His spirit was elated with thankfulness, and fell on His face when His soul was agonizing in prayer.

(3) He did not mean there should be no worship of *voice*. "With the tongue," says the Apostle, "we bless God, even the Father." Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God; and the prisoners heard them. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth will speak. In secret worship intenseness of desire will break out in words; and also, as Bishop Hopkins says, "it may be a means to help to raise our affections," and adds, "in our joining with others it helps to raise and quicken their affections." When a congregation joins audibly in the responses of our Liturgy, it enlivens and helps—is a real aid to devotion. Hearty services help to heartfelt worship.

Having seen what our Lord did not mean—He did not mean that there should be no worship of place, time, body or voice—let us

II. Enquire what He did mean when He said, "They that worship the Father must worship Him in spirit and truth."

(1) "IN SPIRIT." He meant this. Whether it be the stated worship of the church, the social gathering, the family, the closet, or the occasional or ejaculatory prayer in any place at any time; whether there be the bowed head, the bended knee, the prostrate body, the uplifted and clasped hands, the raised or downcast eye, the supplicating or praising voice, or not—and these may be dispensed with, according to circumstances, strength, opportunity—there must be worship in spirit, the mind, intellect, and understanding must be engaged, the desires and feelings alive; whether the outward accompaniment be present or absent, "all that is within us" must be in action and on the alert. There is the death of the man when the soul is separated from the body; and there is the death of devotion when heart is separated from the lip. In the words of Gurnall, "The melodious sound from a musical instrument is formed in the belly of the instrument; the melody of prayer comes from within a man. When you send for a book, would you be pleased with one who brings only the cover? Will God accept the skin for sacrifice? The outward part of the duty is the cup; the inward feelings are the wine God desires to taste." Brethren, you cannot mock God with mere external worship. God is a spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit. He penetrates the solitude of the inner man: so that the petition of the lips cannot pass with Him for prayer, seeing He hearkens for the inaudible language of the heart. The melody of the voice passes not with Him for praise; He listens for harmony swept from the inner chords of the soul.

(2) "IN TRUTH." The former expression, "in spirit," is opposed to mere outward, formal, material worship of place, time, body. This expression, "in truth," is opposed to worshipping God through symbols, types, and ceremonies, which were mirrors reflecting and representing truths to the Jews of the earlier and darker dispensation—pictures for the childhood of the Church—which under this clearer Gospel Dispensation are done away. "We use great plainness of speech, and not as Moses." God is a spirit; and seeking and requiring spiritual worship, will also be worshipped in truth, in a plain, straightforward, simple manner; not through types, figures, symbols, emblems, knowing how prone man is to rest in the sign and not reach the thing signified, to have his thoughts busy with the symbol, and get not at the thing symbolized. He has delivered us from a yoke which our fathers were not able to bear—burdensome in its intricate emblems and symbols to the mind, as in other respects to the body—and we must not entangle ourselves again in that yoke of bondage. This statement, "must worship in truth," opposes all ritualistic, symbolical worship; all making ceremonial deeds and gesture the outward shrine of doctrine—the vehicle of teaching—even where true doctrine is symbolized.

Two symbols, or emblems, or sacraments only has Christ appointed in His Church: Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. We must not add to His word in this respect any more than in any other. God knows us better than we know ourselves. He knows how the Jews were apt to grovel in the letter, and not rise to the spiritual meaning; to lie among the pots and not to soar on silver wings to things above; and how apt we are to do the same. God knows that sumptuous music will stop man's spirit on its way to join in the chant which sweeps around the everlasting throne; that processions tend to thoughts of self rather than of heavenly things; that people will be counting lamps and candles, rather than seeking to have their souls enlightened and warmed by the light of truth; and that a fidgetty attention to holding the hands this way, and the head that—according to the minute and trivial directions of the "Ritual Reason Why," and similar books—bowing the head a certain distance at the name of Jesus, and further at the name of the Trinity, taking the bread in a particular way with the hands, and receiving the cup with a certain curvature and shaping of the fingers, will so engross the mind that the inner man rises not to God, thinks not of Christ, realises not its needs, feels no faith, love, or hope, and makes no resolutions of obedience. Brethren, worship God in spirit; and in order to this, beware of things in worship which distract attention, whether outward things generally, or outward and visible signs called aids to devotion, but apt to be hindrances; to be lead to weigh down the soul, rather than wings on which to soar to God and heaven. But if God is to be worshipped "in truth"—in a plain, open, simple manner, without symbols even when they are symbolical of right doctrine—how much more to be avoided and repudiated is the ritual which is significant of false doctrine. We are to worship with a literal, not a figurative, worship. It is to be substantial, not shadowy: having an openly manifest not concealed meaning. The Greek word for "in truth" is derived from a root meaning "that which does not conceal." We are not to worship by acts having meaning hidden and underlying them.

Ritualism would be objectionable if it were merely what is declared to be one of its purposes in the "Ritual Reason Why," viz., "to uphold the dignity of Divine worship." If it merely "arrested public attention"—to quote from a work by Mr. Loraine—"by its introduction of customs and costumes totally unfamiliar, disturbing the rich but sober order of our Anglican Ritual—with

spectacular effects and histrionic performances: and having added to the chaste and simple vestments of the clergy, an entire wardrobe of curious and decorative apparel, the very names of which are unknown to English Churchmen." "To satisfy," as we are told by an ingenious and daring apologist of the most advanced school, "the cravings of persons of refined artistic and imaginative tastes and faculties—to please women and children—to interest working men." If it were merely, "to learn a lesson from the stage, and in imitation of theatrical managers who make gorgeous spectacles their main attraction, and a telling stage procession draw crowds night after night, or in imitation of the Odd Fellows and Foresters, who by processions with badges, music and banners as needful appliances, attract members and keep them together, or in imitation of the keeper of the gin palace, who finds painting, light, and music necessary adjuncts." If this were all that was signified by a pompous Ritual and gorgeous decorative art, "even though learnt from the gin palace and stage, however we might question the taste, the religious utility, or even propriety," in the light of our text—Ritualism would not have the serious objections against it which it has—nor need its employment arouse the strong and widespread opposition it does. If Ritualism had, moreover, that other end in view, mentioned in the "Ritual Reason Why," as partly to shadow forth by outward deed and gesture certain *truths* which might otherwise be lost sight of, provided they really were truths it shadowed forth—however such worship is opposed to the worship the Father seeks, requires, and desires—it would not be the serious thing it is, when "it is employed to be the object lesson of religion, but that religion a false one: the symbol of theological thought, but that theological thought neither in the word of God nor our Prayer Book and Articles; the outward shrine of doctrine, but that doctrine the doctrine of the Church of Rome—a movement professing to bring to light some forgotten love of the early Church, but thereby undermining the ancient scriptural foundations of our religious belief, and so sapping the strongholds of our nation's strength."—LORAINE. This is the great reason for opposing Ritualism, though the other two objections to Ritualism as histrionic and symbolising some truths are strong. This is the great reason for opposing Ritualism, viz.: that Ritualism full blown is symbolized popery.

With two practical remarks I conclude:—

(1.) And I urge this in no Pharisaic spirit. Let us pray for those ministers who teach not, and those deluded persons who hold not, the truth of the Gospel in its simplicity. Nothing is impossible with God. The Apostle Paul was once a persecuting Pharisee. Bishop Latimer was once a bigoted Papist; Thomas Scott was once opposed to evangelical truth.

(2) While we contend for a worship of truth, namely, plain, unsymbolical worship, let us practise a worship of spirit. To many worshippers at plain services, as well as worshippers at Ritualistic services, might be said: "Bring no more vain oblations." "This people draw nigh to me with their lips, but their heart is far from me."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1881.

OUR correspondent "Veritas" will see by previous articles that we advocate the Contagious Diseases Acts entirely on Christian grounds and as being in accord with the "Bible code of morals." Surely he does not contend that because this legislation has a sanitary aim it is therefore un-Christian and immoral! Unlike the dishonest, immoral and un-Christ-like Irish Land Bill, it does not, as we have shown, break Commandments, and do evil that good may come. It represses the trade of prostitution; its complete extirpation has ever and we fear ever will defy the powers and resources of law, physic, and divinity. However, we regard these Acts merely as effective deterrents of a great sin and a fearful disease. We cannot any longer reconcile it to our conscience to join "Veritas" and other esteemed correspondents in standing by, and giving a silent sanction to the misanthropic exhortations to our Phrynias and Timandras.

> Consumptions sow
> In hollow bones of man; strike their sharp shins,
> And mar men's spurring. Crack the lawyer's voice,
> That he may never more false title plead,
> Nor sound his quillets shrilly; hoar the flamen,
> That scolds against the quality of flesh,
> And not believes himself; down with the nose,
> Down with it flat; take the bridge quite away
> Of him, that his particular to foresee,
> Smells from the general weal; make curl-pate ruffians bald;
> And let the unscarr'd braggarts of the war
> Derive some pain from you: Plague all;
> That your activity may defeat and quell
> The source of all erection,—There's more gold!—
> Do you damn others, and let this damn you,
> And ditches grave you all!

There are other great preventive measures which the Church if not the State ought to adopt, such as promotion of godly discipline, early marriages

and female emigration. There is one seemingly strong objection to the Acts given, viz.: that they are one-sided in their operation and shew a favouritism to men as against women; and this in the minds of many men as well as women is but partially met by the fact that the subjected women alone make a trade of vice. If it were practicable we should be glad to redress the inequality by a fine or imprisonment inflicted on every male who spreads the disease. It must, however, be borne in mind that woman has by nature more control and power in preventing fornication than man, and that she is "eventually" more benefited than man by this legislation, because she and her children are eventually the greatest sufferers from this indelible, transferable and hereditary blood-disease. Inasmuch as husband and wife are physically one flesh and one blood, it is absurd to urge, as Christian opponents do, that men and women have separate and distinct interests involved in these Acts "which create" as they say "invidious, cruel and oppressive distinction, between sex and sex."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I think you have fairly and satisfactorily answered my difficulty on the subject of the Contagious Diseases Act (or Acts). I have been long and painfully vacillating on the subject, but I now see that my chief difficulty is fairly removed. I am glad to be able to think we may, without condoning or promoting vice, provide for the health of the immense numbers who are liable to be affected by the vice of others without any responsibility on their own part. Experience and argument alike lead to the same conclusion. C. P. R.

SIR,—The supporters of the above Acts argue upon sanitary grounds, that their continued and extended operation would be for the benefit of the whole country. In countries where the conscription is in force, or military service generally compulsory, perhaps sanitary reasons alone would suffice. But when England comes to that, or even to the admission into her legislature "on affirmation" of such men as the junior member for Northampton, she must cease to refer to the Bible for her code of morals. When a Government stops short at sanitary legislation, in such a matter as this, it simply reduces vice to a system. Why has not the Legislature proceeded to adopt punitative and remedial measures? Such remedies would better deserve the title of "compassionate, that is, Christ-like," than the inevitable systematization of a traffic which tends virtually to license a class to pursue as a trade, a calling which a Christian Legislature ought to extirpate by debarring its followers from all the privileges of citizenship. It is a very narrow "platform" to advocate the relegation on sanitary grounds of the "regulation of vice," into the hands of the magistrate and policeman. VERITAS.

SIR,—Your correspondent "C. P. R." will soon cease to be puzzled if he will examine his own argument in the light of reason, assisted with a little common sense and knowledge of the world. It is not true that these Acts confer perfect safety from disease; they reduce it enormously, both in extent and severity, but under however perfect a system there will always be some disease among common prostitutes, and necessarily among men who resort to them. Hence this argument that the Acts make vice safe is incorrect. But vice and disease are two different things. One man may lead a vicious life for many years, even for his whole life, and escape disease, while another may carry to his grave the result of his first yielding to temptation. A man contracts disease not because he sins, but because he sins with a diseased woman. Disease depends greatly upon physical causes which bear no relation whatever to the amount of vicious indulgence. If fornication be, as our Church has it, a deadly sin, surely it is so under any circumstances, whether it be committed in places where the Acts are in force or where they are not, whether committed with a mistress or a common prostitute. If all this be true, it seems to me that clergymen place themselves in a very false position by using such an argument as "C. P. R.'s." For practically they say this—"We are very sorry to be compelled to state that our efforts to teach chastity and purity are vain. We cannot persuade men and women to be pure and chaste because it is their duty to be so; we must hold out *in terrorem* the fear of a foul and loathsome disease; take that fear away, and we are helpless." And if these diseases tend to make people chaste, we must not stop at the repeal of these Acts; we must shut up all our voluntary lock hospitals, and refuse to treat any patients suffering from them; we must not check but foster these precious diseases, which are capable of such moral results. I could say much more, Sir, but I trust that I have shown "C. P. R." that his argument, though apparently at first a strong one, is in reality a miserable rag, behind which any honest man ought to be ashamed to shelter himself. I answer without any hesitation that the Acts do not pander to immorality. A man who wishes to be chaste from the only proper motive, because it is his duty, can be so in Plymouth where the Acts are, quite as well as in London where they are not. And if he choose to gratify his passions, he will not stop to calculate the chances of infection, knowing well that for every case of infection there are at least an equal number of escapes.

Is W. M. Moorsom aware that a Select Committee of the House of Commons reported as follows in 1862, just two years before the first Act was passed?—"Your Committee have refrained from entering into the painful details which have come to their knowledge of the state of our naval and military stations at home as regards prostitution. These facts are so appalling that they feel it a duty to press upon the Government the necessity of at once grappling with the mass of vice, filth, and disease which surrounds the soldiers' barracks and the seamen's homes, which not only crowds our hospitals with sick, weakens the roll of our effectives, and swells the list of our invalids, but which surely, however slowly, saps the vigour of our soldiers and our seamen, sows the seeds of degradation and degeneracy, and causes an amount of suffering difficult to over-estimate." So much for the ignorance in which these Acts were introduced into England The Act of 1866 was the result of a two years' medical

inquiry by the Admiralty, and the Act of 1869 followed the reports of Select Committees both of the House of Lords and House of Commons. The Royal Commission of 1870 reported most favourably of these Acts, and five debates have taken place in the House of Commons within the last eleven years on motions to repeal the Acts, in four of which the motions were defeated by large majorities, and in one it was "talked out." A Select Committee of the House of Commons has been sitting now for two years, the evidence before which has been overwhelming in favour of these Acts in reducing disease, and promoting the social and moral improvement of those unfortunate women for whom philanthropy has done so little. So much for the ignorance which continues and wishes to extend these Acts!

1st August, 1881. A SURGEON.

THE REVISED VERSION.

SIR,—Dr. Reichel says in his last letter to you "that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written to Jewish Christians (in Palestine) in its present form, and is not a translation, no man in his senses doubts."

In *The Academy* for Feb. 1, 1879, he will find a review, bearing the double signature of Dr. Sanday and the Rev. Joseph T. Fowler, of a work by Biesenthal on the Epistle—in which work Biesenthal has set himself to prove that the Epistle is a tract originally written by Paul in Mishnical Hebrew for the consolation chiefly of Palestinian Christians, and afterwards translated by Luke. Biesenthal has even retranslated the Epistle into Mishnical Hebrew, pointing out what he conceives to have been misreadings and misrenderings of the Greek translator. And, seeing that the verdict of his critics is "we should hesitate to admit that his theory may be taken as proved," it is obvious that Dr. Reichel's words need to be greatly modified.

I have never studied the subject, and I had become imbued with a very strong prejudice against the Pauline theory, but I cannot lightly overlook the fact that Clement of Alexandria, apparently on the authority of the still earlier Pantaenus, affirmed that this Epistle was written by Paul to the Hebrews in Hebrew, and afterwards translated and published by Luke.

The *status* of Greek in Palestine, more particularly Galilee, was probably very nearly analogous to the *status* of English in Wales—except that Aramaic would in all likelihood remain the ordinary language of the upper as well as of the lower classes, whereas Welsh is not the ordinary language of the upper classes of Welshmen living in Wales. And the natural supposition is that Jesus would use Aramaic when speaking to an audience all of whom understood Aramaic; that he would use Greek when speaking to an audience of whom all understood Greek but not all understood Aramaic; and that in speaking to an audience of whom some did not understand Greek and others did not understand Aramaic he would adopt the language in which the greater number would be able to follow him.

Is not "a Dr. Roberts" the Reviser of that name?

EDWARD B. NICHOLSON.

London Institution.

SIR,—A few remarks in reference to Archdeacon Reichel's letter in your last impression seem to be called for. The Archdeacon says, "the writer falls into a mistake for which others are responsible—those from whom he has borrowed his opinions. It is the assumption—without a particle of proof—that our Saviour and the Apostles spoke nothing but Aramaic." I think if the Archdeacon will kindly read the passage in my sermon again, he will see no such statement—no such assumption. Neither am I aware that I have any blame to throw upon others, as I am responsible for the opinions expressed. What I hold is that Syriac was the language of Western Galilee, and that when our Lord taught His disciples to pray, He did so in the vulgar tongue. The Rabbinical character of the prayer makes this the more probable. The Archdeacon himself admits that "Our Saviour, like other persons who are bilingual, would naturally use the more national language in moments of deepest feeling." This is all that is needed for my argument. I am not unacquainted with Dr. Roberts's theory and arguments. This is not the place to discuss them; they have been dealt with in many other places. If he has proved anything, it is that the people of Palestine were bilingual. But almost all sound critics hold that Syriac was the vernacular in *common use* among simple people. At the close of the letter the Archdeacon says "that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written to Jewish Christians—and is not a translation, no man in his senses doubts." It has nothing to do with any statement of mine, but I cannot forbear reminding the writer that Eusebius H. E., l. vi., c. xiv., preserves to us the opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus, "But the Epistle to the Hebrews he asserts was written by Paul in the Hebrew tongue (Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ), but that Luke carefully translated (μεθερμηνεύσαντα) it, and published it among the Greeks." Whether these very early opinions be correct or not, it seems to have been overlooked by your esteemed correspondent.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

THE ART OF SPEAKING AND READING.

BY THE REV. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.,
VICAR OF BRIGSTOCK.

(Continued from page 32.)

We rather expected, and almost hoped that our last paper would have brought upon us the righteous ire of some of our many clerical friends. Our remarks on intoning were severe, and considering how much the thing is practised and, perhaps, liked, it is somewhat strange that no one has attempted to controvert what was said. It would have served no bad purpose, and might have accomplished a good one if some stickler for it had come forward to defend it. This, however, has not been done, and we must be content to plod our weary way, but not "with congregated loads adhering close to the clogged wheels."

We explained in our last what we understood by the principle of the key-tone. We gave reasons for appreciating it, and also for acquiring the power of applying it. We promised to give further reasons—or rather *a* further reason—for doing all this. We promised too to shew how facility in these matters may be obtained. It will be our object in this paper to fulfil our promises.

It is usual with an untrained voice to rise—why we cannot exactly say—as the speaker warms to his subject. That it does so is a mere matter of experience. Some of us, perhaps, know this to our cost. All of us have undoubtedly witnessed it, if not in our-

selves, at least in others. Let us describe our experience. We have on many an occasion composed ourselves to listen to an address. We have noticed how all the preliminaries were properly managed—the chair, the water, all duly arranged. The exciting moment has arrived, and the speaker is on his feet. We were breathless. So was he. Presently he was a little composed. We felt easier. He has disposed his hands—oh, those hands how often we could have cut them off!—cleared his throat and looked round. Now he begins. His subject takes hold of him. He is excited. His voice rises. There is a fresh rush of fervour at every sentence. Higher and higher he goes. What is to be done now? He began rather low, but now he is very high. He cannot go higher, and his fervour impels him. His breath is gone, and with it his power of utterance. Poor man! we feel for him. He knows it, stops, sips a little water, begins again, and goes exactly through the same process. He would fain have come down from his high and lofty position, but he could not. He has never learnt.

Now, we say nothing of the weariness which a process of this kind causes to the speaker, and the sense of fatigue it gives to the audience. There is a sort of telegraphic communication established between speaker and audience, so that his feelings are at once transmitted to them. If he is weak they are weak; if he is wearied they are wearied. We might go through the whole gamut of sensations, and in every case we should find that that of the audience harmonises with that of the speaker. How awkward, for instance they are, and how nervous he is if he do but cherish these things! And it is remarkable that these feelings are intensified in the same ratio as he gives the cue. All this, however, we leave out of the account; but we say, and say emphatically, "such things ought not to be." It is not seemly. It spoils the effect of what is said. There is a remedy.

We appeal now to our clerical friends, especially to those who preach. Have you never felt this? Have you not often wished, when speaking, to change the tone of your voice? You confess it is so, and at the time too, you have felt that you would have given anything if you could have done it. "This tone is not right," you have said, "if I could only hit upon another, how much more effective what I am saying would be." But you have not known how to hit upon another. Here then the principle of the key-tone comes to your help. It is rather difficult to say all that should be said about it on paper, but we shall do our best.

It is important here to recall what we have already said, that the tone of the voice must be suited to the subject. Low tones suit solemn subjects; middle tones ordinary subjects; high tones exciting subjects. To be mindful of this will make the matter easier. We now give some exercises, which we know from experience, will give the power to appreciate and apply the principle of the key-tone.

Our first exercise is one recommended by Signor Garcia. Sit down to the piano. Strike a note—sufficiently, of course, within the range of the voice. Let it die out. Remember it. Sing it. While singing, strike the note again to test the accuracy. Strike another note and proceed in the same way. Continue the practice until you can produce any note you might strike with ease. The object of this exercise is to train the ear to distinguish sound from sound—low from high—and the voice to produce it.

Nextly, take a word: *fall* will do. Give it out on the lowest tone of your voice. Give it out on the middle tone. Give it out on the high tone. Practise passing from each to either at will.

Then, take three lines; the following will do:—

(1) "Not a drum was heard, not a funeral note,"

(2) "A ray of disappointed hope the midnight path explored."

(3) "Half a league, half a league, half a league onward."

Practice (1) on the low tone, (2) on the middle tone, and (3) on the high tone of the voice. These tones once fixed will serve as keys. It will be possible at once to produce them. Our readers may take it for granted, until they know by experience, that they can refer everything they have to say or read to one or other of these tones. Now the writer has never seen or heard or come across anything that puts the principle of the key-tone in so simple a way as this. Signor Garcia's exercise, original with him no doubt, was given with a different object. He believes it to be one of the grandest secrets—if not *the* grandest—of oratory. He hopes, therefore, that students will do him the favour of mastering it for themselves. He does not hope, as he does not care, for any credit in seeking to promulgate it. His reward will be in the satisfaction that important work will be better done.

It will be better, for some time not to go further These three lines should be first very well fixed. When, however, this is done, the following, numbered (1), (2), (3), may be referred to the lines so numbered above:—

(1) "I am thy father's spirit;
Doom'd for a certain term to walk the night;
And, for the day, confined to fast in fires,
Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature,
Are burnt and purged away. But that I am forbid
To tell the secrets of my prison-house,
I could a tale unfold, whose lightest word
Would harrow up thy soul; freeze thy young blood:
Make thy two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres;
Thy knotted and combined locks to part;
And each particular hair to stand on end—
Like quills upon the fretful porcupine;
But this eternal blazon must not be
To ears of flesh and blood. List, list, O list,
If thou didst ever thy dear father love,
Revenge his foul and most unnatural murder."

(2) "My pipe is lit, my grog is mix'd,
My curtains drawn and all is snug,
Old Puss is in her elbow chair,
And Tray is sitting on the rug.
Last night I had a curious dream;
Miss Susan Bates was Mistress Mogg—
What d'ye think of that my Cat?
What d'ye think of that my Dog?"

(3) "I sprang to the stirrup and Joris and he;
I galloped, Dirk galloped, we galloped all three;
'Good speed,' cried the watch as the gate-bolts undrew,
'Speed' echoed the wall to us galloping through;
Behind shut the postern, the lights sank to rest,
And into the midnight we galloped abreast."

The result of all this practice, if carefully undertaken and accomplished, will be exceedingly happy indeed. The student will find himself in possession of a new power, and will be constantly wishing to exercise it. He will have no difficulty in passing from high to low, or from low to middle, &c., &c. He will be constantly ringing changes on his notes. Then he will refer everything he utters to one or other of these tones. He will say, "Should it be low, middle, or high?" The fiddler knows the moment he puts his finger on the string whether it gives out the proper note or not,

and alters it if it does not. It will be precisely so with him.

The writer is free to confess that he knows no greater charm than the possession of this power. He speaks from experience—and that not altogether personal—and he strongly advises all who have to speak in public to seek and cultivate it. We do not know the powers of the human voice. They are as many as they are subtle. They wing words as arrows, and give them point and efficacy. They are the very life of words. The obvious inference is—cultivate these powers. It is by no means in any sense labour lost.

Before closing this paper it may be advantageous to speak of a kindred subject. It is strange how often things go in pairs. If we examine the three lines above, we shall find that the rate of movement will be different in each case. The first line is low, the rate of movement is slow; the second is middle, the rate of movement is moderate; the third is high, the rate of movement is fast. We recognise propriety in all this. Funerals do not gallop. A regiment of cavalry, when about to make a charge, does not creep, &c., &c.

We have, then, three pairs of terms:—Low and slow; middle and moderate; high and quick. The process of applying these terms is very easy when the power is once acquired. We repeat, we know of no greater charm.

Reviews and Notices.

"Our New New Testament." By Edward Byron Nicholson, M.A., Principal Librarian of the London Institution. London: Rivingtons. 1881. Pp. 80.

This is a valuable, and, on the whole, very accurate and trustworthy criticism of the Revised Version. The author's views, whenever they are adverse to the renderings of the Revisers, are sustained and illustrated by a richness of scholarship which is sadly if not culpably wanting in some of the reviews we have met with. For instance, he annotates Matthew xii. 32: "It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come," as follows:—

Here and in xiii. 22, 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 30, a minority of the Revisers rightly desired to substitute "age" for "world."

The English word "world"—formerly *weorold*, *woruld* (as still pronounced in some parts of the kingdom), from the stems of *wer* "man" (as in "werewolf" = "manwolf"), and *aldr* "age" (cf. "alder"-man, "eld," "old"). The Icelandic form *veröld* still bears on its face its derivation (*verr* "man," *öld* "age")—originally meant "age of man," "duration of human life"; thence it came to mean "living people," and lastly, "the inhabited globe."

It is used in the New Testament to translate two quite different Greek words—*aiōn*, "age," and *kosmos*, "universe." It is the former which is found here and in xiii. 22, 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 30.

It is in the first place a very serious mistake to render two Greek words of such different meaning by the same English word. In the second place, except in the New Testament and the Book of Common Prayer ("world without end"), the word "world" is entirely obsolete in its original sense, and it may safely be said that even in those books no ordinary reader has any idea but that the word means "the earth."

Not only is "world" utterly misleading as a representative of the Greek *aiōn*, "age"—it is extremely important for doctrinal reasons that the Greek word should be clearly rendered. But, alas, "end of the world" might be wrongly quoted from the English New Testament *until* the end of the world, so far as concerned a majority of the Revisers, though a minority did try to substitute "consummation of the age" (as for instance in verse 39).

The present little work unfortunately only comments on St. Matthew's Gospel; we hope the reception of it by scholars as well as the educated public will be such as to induce the author to apply his unprejudiced powers and sound scholarship to the whole of the New Testament. We hold it to be an advantage, in these days of strong theological partizanship, to have the sacred text construed by one who avows himself with apparent truth to be perfectly neutral in reference to religious opinions. We do not agree with Mr. Nicholson in his contention for the invariable translation of the Greek as a definite article; it ought, we think, to be sometimes omitted or rendered by our indefinite article. The Greeks had no indefinite article, and therefore must have individualized in a different manner from what we do. Mr. Nicholson's observations on the rendering of the aorist tense and on the punctuation in the Revised Version are, we believe, quite accurate, and well worthy of attention in any future Revision.

"The Clergyman's Magazine," which is conducted by members of the Church Homiletical Society, is a most valuable publication; especially for the younger clergy. The Rev. Henry Lansdell, Eyre Cottage, The Grove, Blackheath, is the editor, and under his able guidance, this monthly magazine is gradually taking an important and well-earned place among current Church literature. The August number is a fair sample of the average excellence; and its varied contents give a good idea of its aim and scope. The Rev. R. B. Girdlestone, the successful principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, writes the opening paper. It shows the "Bearing of Modern Biblical Criticism on Ministerial work." Mr. Girdlestone deals with "Agnosticism," and "Comparative Theology," in a trenchant and effective manner. This essay of his, or rather "Lecture delivered in the Chapter House of St. Paul's Cathedral," and now printed, will teach inexperienced clergymen the best *method* of handling the Bible in the face of modern scepticism. Then follow some "Outlines of Sermons from the Church Services," by seven well-known preachers; while suitable illustrations and similes are also provided. But these useful "*Outlines*" are in no way akin to the obnoxious "Skeleton Sermons," which remain skeletons in spite of all attempts to put warmth and life into them. We are glad to see that the Bishop of Ossory still continues his vivid and stimulating papers on "Modern Heroes of the Mission Field;" while the lecture on "Church Music" (the first of a set) by the Rev. E. Hall, Precentor of Worcester Cathedral, and the "Scheme for the Augmentation of Poor Benefices in Official Patronage," by Oxoniensis are clearly and carefully written, and deal practically with two most difficult topics. But the best thing in the book comes last, and that is a clever, running criticism on the new theological books of the day, as they are published. In a few pointed sentences the student is guided in his selections of what to read, and what to avoid. We suspect this boon to busy clergymen, who want to read, but have no time to waste, is the editor's special task. He certainly has the art of writing most helpfully for others. The half-sovereign per annum, which admits a man to the monthly lectures at St. Paul's Chapter House, and also furnishes him with twelve magazines a year, equal in ability to the one before us, is indeed a good investment from a clerical point of view.

On Friday afternoon the 29th ult., the Archbishop of Canterbury and family entertained nine hundred of the poor of Lambeth. The guests first met in St. Mary's parish church to hear an address by the Archbishop's domestic chaplain, the Rev. R. T. Davidson. Among the crowded congregation were two hundred mothers with babies in their arms. Tea was provided in the library, which was filled three times over. At eight o'clock the Evening Hymn was sung, and his Grace gave his blessing.

On Friday, the 29th ult., an influential meeting of a few Rugbeians, hastily summoned at the instance of Sir R. Cross, Mr. Goschen, M.P., Mr. Justice Bowen, Mr. Horace Davey, M.P., Mr. F. Dumergue, and the Head Master (Dr. Jex Blake), to whom "it seemed hardly right to allow one of the most distinguished of Rugbeians to pass away without at once considering how they might best commemorate at the school itself the late Dean of Westminster," took place at Willis's Rooms. Mr. Thomas Hughes occupied the chair, and after some discussion it was resolved to open a subscription, to call a meeting in November next, and to appoint Mr. C. H. Stanton and Gen. Trevor secretaries for that purpose.

The Duke of Westminster has written to the morning papers suggesting that as a memorial both of the late Dr. Stanley and of his wife, a permanent building should be erected for the Nursing Home and Training School for Nurses, founded in 1874 by Lady Augusta in connection with the Westminster Hospital. "From that time to her death she devoted constant effort to the establishment of the institution on a permanent basis, and chiefly by her influence and that of the Dean some £12,000 was subscribed for the purpose of obtaining an eligible site in the vicinity of the hospital and erecting the necessary accommodation. Various causes have retarded this part of the original design, but now that the Dean himself, its main support, has passed away, it is felt more important than ever to press on the work to completion as a memorial of both the benefactors who originated, and during their lives so greatly contributed to its success as an institution for the benefit of the sick poor primarily, and of all in need of trained nurses in the hours of sickness."

Wednesday, the 20th ult., was Prize-day at Uppingham. After service in the chapel, the recitation of prize exercises took place. Mr. Thring took occasion to say that the school, in recognising athletics at the prize-giving, did not do so to glorify mere swiftness of foot or strength of limb, but because only in bodies well trained could we find a thorough capacity for doing in the best possible way work in every sphere of life. In a short review of the past year—a year of peace and getting into order after a great shaking—he called attention to the completion of a new aisle to the chapel and to a design for decorating the schoolroom, which he said was part of a consistent effort to lift education above the mean settings in which it had been left in bygone years. The list of honours included the Ninth Wrangler and a scholarship at Cambridge, a First in Moderations at Oxford, the First in the Indian Civil Service of 1880, and in the army examination from Sandhurst, and a hundred guinea Scholarship at the Middle Temple. In conclusion, the Head Master asked Bishop Mitchinson to take his place, and say a few words to the school. The Bishop, who had hurried from the break-up at his old school at Canterbury the day before to be present at Uppingham, which will henceforth, by the Bishop of Peterborough's wish, be part of his Episcopal charge, in hearty and kind words expressed his long-established and warm interest in the school with which he had now become officially connected. After luncheon the school choir gave a performance of the "May Queen," and a garden party at the Head Master's closed the day.

On Friday, the 29th ult., the Bishop of Liverpool invited the President of the Wesleyan Conference, together with the ex-President, Dr. Rigg, and a few others to meet a number of his clergymen. Luncheon was provided at the Palace. The meeting was of a purely friendly character. The Bishop, in a few hearty words, expressed the pleasure it gave him to welcome the President of the Wesleyan Conference and his brethren. He referred to his grandfather's association with John Wesley, and the influence which his teaching had exerted on his own life, and expressed his joy at the great work which Wesleyan Methodism had accomplished. The President of the Conference replied. Mr. W. P. Nevins, Editor of the *Christian Apologist*, having asked Bishop Ryle if he considers these ministers as truly priests, the Bishop replied :— "Wesleyan ministers are certainly not clergymen of the Church of England ; but, after all the unkind treatment which John Wesley and his people received from the Church of England last century, and after the good work they have done, I shall never hesitate to treat them with respect."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Burn, Rev. William John, curate of Jarrow ; incumbent of St. St. Peter's, Jarrow.

Daubeny, Rev. John, rector of Catsfield, Sussex; vicar of Winkfield, Berks.

Davies, Rev. J. Paget (formerly railway chaplain to the Bishop of Peterborough) ; rector of Streat, near Brighton.

Engleheart, Rev. George Herbert, vicar of Chute Forest, Wilts.

Fitzpatrick, Rev. N. Richard, curate of Paddington Parish church; vicar of Woodford Wells, Essex.

Harris, Rev. Stanford, rector of St. Barnabas', Oldham-road, Manchester ; incumbent of St. Paul's, Hoddlesdon, near Darwen.

Jefferey, Rev. Samuel, assistant-inspector of religious instruction for the diocese of Durham.

Rooke, Rev. Thomas, chaplain of St. George's Hospital, London ; vicar of Feckenham.

Salmon, Rev. Frank, rector of Langton Long, Blandford, Dorset.

Sclater, Rev. Francis Saunderson, perpetual curate and titular vicar of St. Anne, Dropmore, Bucks.

Sharpe, Rev. William Robert, curate of Harpsden ; rector of Westwell, Oxon.

Sharrock, Rev. James Albert, curate in sole charge of Holy Trinity, Stockton-on-Tees.

White, Rev. Francis de Lacy, perpetual curate and titular vicar of Fenny Stratford, Bucks.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Buxton, Rev. Fowell Arthur, second son of T. F. Buxton, Esq., of Easneye, Herts, and late curate of All Saints', Knightsbridge, on the 31st ult., aged 30.

Causton, Rev. Charles, hon. canon of Winchester Cathedral, at Lasham Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 79.

Davies, Ven. Rowland Robert, senior archdeacon and vicar-general of Tasmania, at Ferndean, Hobart Town, on the 13th Nov., 1880, aged 75.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"REDEEMING THE TIME."

By the Rev. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M.A., Rector of Glaston, Uppingham; formerly Fellow and Tutor of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached at Riseholme.

"Redeeming the time, because the days are evil."—Ephes. v. 16.

THERE can be no one who is called by a Christian name who has not at some time or other felt a *wish* to do right instead of wrong; there can be very few who have not done right once or twice in their lives in spite of a struggle. Having done right by God's help, we have felt the better for it: some have gone on trying and trying again and again to do right and to resist wrong; and if they have come to God for it through His Eternal Son, they have had strength supplied to enable them to do so by the Grace of the Holy Spirit, who first put it into their minds and hearts to try to refuse the evil or to choose the good.

All of us, however, know that there have been, and that there are, difficulties in the right way.

If it was the Holy Spirit through our conscience saying that we ought to pray or read our Bible, somebody perhaps came, or you were sleepy—there was a difficulty; you found "the days" were "evil." You persevered, however. If you did *not*, pray now to God for pardon and grace, and try again, in the strength that He will give.

And sometimes it is something faulty which God lets us see, that we may try to amend it for His glory: some wicked word or wicked deed which is in the power of our will to say or not say, to do or not do; something either unbecoming, dishonest, or irreverent; something conceited, or unkind, or profane. You found yourself inclined to sin in this or that way; a time of temptation came, you were in company where it was easy to tell the story, or whatever the wrong thing was—it was easier to say or do it than to let it alone: we found "the days" were "evil."

We may have to go on for years and years finding "the days evil": that is, trying to do right and to forsake sin; and they who are really set to live godly must even (the Scripture says) suffer persecution. Only let us not flatter ourselves that we are altogether suffering for Christ when by our own foolishness or inconsiderateness we are tempting others to sin by despising or ill-treating us. But it is far better for us to be finding the difficulty of doing right day by day, for years and generations, than to be evil ourselves with the times; it is something to thank God for, if we succeed by His grace in getting a good bit out of every evil day. "The days are evil": and our heavenly Father has suffered them so to be; but His will is to deliver us from evil, and to keep us from the Evil One.

In "good times" scarcely a day is so stormy that no work can be done in the fields; but in some seasons day after day is "evil"; and when such days come, the prudent man makes the best of it, and sees if he cannot find work that can be done under shelter. Our heavenly Father, who has set the seasons, has also the government of the course of this world, and of the circumstances of our lives; and however "evil the days are" for doing the good work of His glory and of salvation in, He never suffers any single day to be so "evil" but that, if we will do as He directs our consciences, it is possible for us to spend part of the day to good account.

We think it good farming when a farmer makes the best out of difficulties, and makes the most of opportunities. He has his chances, we say: he can get the better of some bad land or waste ground. The seasons may be very bad and the "days" very "evil," and they are of course past his control, and something may be put down to chance or luck; still, in the worst of times patience and prudence will do something. And so, in the greatest difficulties and temptations—greater than we have ever known—the fear and love of God will find a way, and instead of the days getting the better of us, we shall get the better of them, for God's glory and by His grace. We should like to make up for lost time; but we can never do that: "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof," and the most favoured child of God cannot look for strength more than as our days. The love of Christ is sufficient to cover the past for them who love Him; and if we love Him we shall stretch forth to the things which are before, and strengthen the things which remain. No merits of ours can ever make up for the past, or in that sense redeem the time; but what the Scripture says means this, —Buy up for yourselves the opportunity. No past opportunity can be bought back; but as a like chance is brought in our way, we can seize it steadily. Though the past may go on producing its effects for good or bad upon us, we have nothing to do with the past except repentance: there must indeed be amendment, and making amends if we have wronged others; but that is done not by brooding over the past, but by making a good bargain out of present chances. The thought of the past is good for experience, for correction, and for humbling pride. Our hours as they are coming, and our days, are in the possession of Evil; but they need not remain so. For time is not evil in

itself, any more than land is; but both land and time are worth improving. Both are under a curse for our sake, that God's power put into the bodies and souls of mankind may rescue them. Even good land, if it is not taken in hand and rescued for the crop, will not be better than evil for that year, for the evil will have mastered all goodness in it so far as any crop goes for that year.

Just as the good crops have to be won from the earth and from the bondage under which all creation groans, just (I say) as the good corn has to be purchased from Nature by honest toil and care, and cannot be had without them; so, without earnest watchfulness and steady purpose and faithfulness, we cannot have the use and control of days and hours. If we do not get good out of our time, and particularly out of good opportunities, the evil which besets us and our chances, as we call them, will get the better both of us and of the good which might have been; as the ground which was neglected when there was the opportunity or the season of work, will bring forth weeds, and not that crop of good corn which might have been, aye, and which would have been, if labour and capital had been well employed in securing the chances before they were past and gone.

In some respects the present days may be called "very evil." Events happen so quickly one after another, that we have little time to prepare for an opportunity, and we may find ourselves regretting that we have let it slip before we were fully conscious that it had come; and if we go on regretting too much, some other chances will have gone.

And besides this, there is real objective Evil very powerful in the world.

Nevertheless, aye, and all the more, we must study to redeem the time: to rescue the days for good, to buy up for ourselves each opportunity to use in our Master's service. First we must get hold of the opportunities which come by us, and then we can go out of our way to look for them. God would enlighten our eyes to see plenty of opportunities if we would be wise; and if, feeling our lack of wisdom, we would ask of God, who "giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not"; and let us ask in faith, without doubt or wavering.

"The days are evil"; but here is an opportunity this very hour—an opportunity for each one here to-day—an opportunity to help in missions to the heathen.

"The days are evil"; it is wonderfully easy to do nothing at all for Foreign Missions, and for Home Missions, and for everything; it is not so easy for us to help those who are fulfilling our Saviour's will in preaching the Gospel to every creature, and in making disciples of all nations by baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It is uncommonly easy to do nothing in this matter; we have plenty else to think of; it costs money, or it costs trouble; one or two of the missionaries or members of the societies at home do not go quite our way, or perhaps make some mistake; the heathen are slow to believe; and so on. But let not these evils overcome the good, or make us (like evil servants) lose the opportunity. The opportunity now is to say a prayer, to give an alms, and to render thanks—as you kneel, to ask God to bless so much money as you can offer, so that it may be well spent for His glory. You will (very likely) have another opportunity to pray and give alms, perhaps another opportunity you may expect to-day; but it is *another* opportunity; a like one it may be, but not the same. Let us buy up for ourselves and for God's glory this present occasion, make sure of your prayer now (and ask pardon for past shortcomings), and the next time it will be the second prayer to-day, and not the first—two opportunities reclaimed for God And faithful, united prayer made here in the name of Christ upon these our present opportunities will help as many as are among the heathen and elsewhere in the midst of evil, watching their opportunities to spread His truth and advance His kingdom; and such prayers in England and throughout Christ's Church may help some to watch more faithfully than before. And while we pray that God will accept and bless our offering to His own glory through the salvation of souls, and make our supplications that all Missionaries, as well as other Bishops and Curates, may by their life and doctrine set forth His true and lively Word, and rightly and duly administer His holy Sacraments, we shall find this morning a special opportunity to thank Him for what the Gospel of His Redemption has already done for ourselves and for others who have sat in darkness. For these are among the many benefits of our Saviour's Passion, which is this hour commemorated to His glory and set forth to the eye of faith at His Altar in the holy mysteries of this Sacrament.

Here He offers grace. Here He offers to the faithful that which will buy the opportunities by reason of the value of the Blood which has redeemed us. That grace which He gives us in this and in the other means of grace, is as it were good coin with the Image and superscription of our Lord upon it. And if we carry such spiritual coin with us, the evil days, aye, and even the Evil One himself, cannot, dare not, refuse to yield up to us the precious opportunities of doing good, and forsaking evil, which opportunities we ought to purchase for our Master's use.

It is a losing trade which Satan has chosen, for the grace is of no use to him; but it returns to the glory of God. And even the souls and the opportunities which are for the time in Satan's power he cannot turn to good account: but, as his time is short, in the very passion of evil he loves nothing but to cheat men and women who have to deal with him: and this he succeeds in doing whenever he hinders us from using God's

means of grace; so that he may keep souls captive, and opportunities for good unransomed; for without grace no opportunity is bought.

Let us now therefore use all diligence in the great boldness which is by Jesus Christ, that we may come boldly to the throne of grace that we may find grace to help in every evil day, and for this and every occasion and time of need.

THE PREACHING OF THE WORD.

By the Rev. G. E. WATKINS.

Sermon Preached at St. Stephen's, Westminster, on Sunday, August 7th, 1881.

"The Word of God is not bound."—2 Tim. ii. 9.

"This is the Word of good tidings, which was preached unto you."—1 Peter i. 25. (R. V.)

"THE Word of God is not bound." The Apostle who wrote these most important words, wrote them under circumstances which must have deeply impressed the minds both of himself and of his "beloved child," his "true child in the faith," Timothy, to whom they were addressed. And in connexion with the subject of preaching, it is most significant that the words of my text were addressed to the same person whom St. Paul exhorted to "preach the Word" (2 Tim. iv. 2—5), and to "abide in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a babe thou hast known the Sacred Writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ." (2 Tim. iv. 14, 15. R. V.) And the context shows how deeply St. Paul himself felt the truth of these words, and how greatly they comforted him in his bondage. "According to my Gospel, wherein I suffer hardship unto bonds as a malefactor; but the Word of God is not bound." (2 Tim. ii. 8, 9. R. V.) And this thought comforted him, as he looked back at his chains. "Now I would have you know, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the Gospel." (Phil. i. 12.) "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake." (2 Tim. ii. 10.)

Picture to yourselves St. Paul in prison. Behold the Apostle to the Gentiles a prisoner at Rome, the Gentile metropolis of heathendom; Pagan Rome, the centre, at that period, of the civilized world. He is in prison for the cause of Christ, suffering for his Great Master's sake. He has the certain prospect of a violent death in view; of martyrdom on the block by the order of the infamous, the blood-stained and profligate Nero, the first chief persecutor of the Christians: amongst a series of succeeding Roman Emperors hostile to the faith of Christ, he ranks pre-eminent as the great foe to the Early Christian Church, the prototype of her who should become "drunken with the blood of the saints." (Rev. xvii. 5.) St. Paul can expect no mercy at his hands; he knows that his end is near, that his course is well-nigh finished. And even while he writes he is looking forward to his martyrdom, by a sudden death, as the termination of his imprisonment, the emancipation of his expectant soul. "The time of my departure is at hand," and he expects it joyfully. (Phil. i. 23; 2 Tim. iv. 6—8.) But though he is imprisoned, his Gospel is not; nay, his very bonds assist in its proclamation. "My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places." (Phil. i. 13.) "εν ολω τω πραιτωριω." Lightfoot renders these words ("in all the palace," A. V.) thus: "Throughout the imperial regiments:" the Revised Version of the New Testament translates them: "Throughout the whole Praetorian Guard, and to all the rest." This is the literal rendering of the Greek, instead of "and in all other places," as in the Authorised Version. The Roman Legions or Regiments were recruited from various parts of the then known world, as far as it had been subjected to the sway of Rome. Doubtless there were men in the ranks recruited from our own country. And as our own troops are often on foreign service, so the Roman Legions were seldom long stationary at one camp or post. "And to all the rest." So that, both from the area of enlistment, and the liability to foreign service, these legionaries of different race, of migratory habits, were likely to prove a sure means of communication with the outer world. And indeed the first martyr on English soil, St. Alban, was a Roman soldier. The Apostle could hardly, therefore, have engaged more useful emissaries in the work of furthering a knowledge of the truth. Great traveller though he was, he could not have visited more regions, nor more distant ones, when free, than—when a prisoner—he was able to reach through the instrumentality of his new converts. The good seed which, up to the time of his incarceration at Rome he delighted to sow in "far distant cities" with his own hand, he, now imprisoned, was able to communicate at once, through the instrumentality of others, to the Court of the Roman Emperor at headquarters, and to provinces which acknowledged the sway of Rome in distant lands. It was the thought of this great sphere, the recollection of the vast and limitless regions which he had himself been unable to explore, yet into which his Gospel would find entrance "through his bonds," that enabled him, "for the elect's sake," to rejoice in them. "Most of the brethren in the Lord, being confident through my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the Word of God without fear." (Phil. i. 14.) "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." (2 Tim. ii. 10.)

"But the Word of God is not bound."

Here, then, is the statement which furnishes us with the key to the satisfaction felt by St. Paul, despite his bonds. And it is a statement of universal application; it conveys a truth of vast and practical importance. "Ο Λογος του Θεου," "The Word of God," the written Word, that Word "is not bound." And not only the written Word, but the Gospel, the Word of Inspiration, of direct revelation, spoken by the mouth of the Apostle, that Word was "not bound." The direct, supernatural gift, and divine illumination received by the Apostle from Him who is "Ο Λογος;" that Word, that spiritual gift, that inspired illumination, that Divine enlightenment of his soul, in a word, that "Gospel," or "Word of good tidings," was "not bound." He felt its power in himself; he had seen its efficacy manifested in others; he needed not to reason with Timothy or to persuade himself into a conviction of the truth of his words; human logic, and the intuition of human genius, was superseded by a higher principle, their exercise rendered unnecessary; the Spirit of God assured him that "the Word of God, which liveth and abideth," "abideth for ever" (1 Peter i. 24, 25); that this Word "was not bound." The Word which was in the beginning, His Almighty Word, the Word which was then being preached by St. Paul, and by his fellow-Apostles, by Timothy, "his beloved child," and by other "true children in the faith," the Word which, nineteen centuries ago, "God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ," that "Word was not bound." The Word preached by Jesus Christ, the living Word, and, subsequently, by the Apostles commissioned by Him to preach it, the Word since preached by all faithful ministers, with whom He has promised to be, "even unto the end of the world," that Word "is not bound," "Ου δεδεται" —a tense indicating present as well as past time, "not bound" now, not fettered, nor abrogated, nor superseded, nor rendered less powerful, or less indispensable now, in God's Kingdom on earth, His Church now existing, than it was some nineteen centuries ago, when "Paul the aged," as he describes himself, "and a prisoner," as he adds, "of Jesus Christ," penned, in almost his last Epistle, just previous to his death, the important, universal, and comprehensive statement of my text: "The Word of God is not bound."

The truth of the statement strikes us with increasing force the more we examine it. It is an affirmation which, whether we apply it to the Word read, or the Word preached, the word as a means of Grace open to all, or as a direct and special revelation, whether we understand it in a general sense as applying in principle to the whole world, to which the Word is destined to go forth, or whether we restrict its application in a particular sense to the visible Church, as defined in the XIXth Article; in whatever sense we understand and apply it, this affirmation is a "Word of good tidings" as important as any we are called on to to believe, a truth as indispensable as any other Article of the Christian Faith. It is a truth, moreover, which must be received before the foundation can be laid of any superstructure against which the "Gates of hell shall not prevail," of any system of Christian faith and morals which can cope with earthly systems, or worldly codes of ethics, or help in the great work of perfecting the Christian life and character in any soul of man.

Having thus stated and illustrated the importance of the truth contained in my text, and its universal application, its vast and far-reaching influence in working out the designs of the Almighty, Whose Word is Almighty as Himself, and having further shown that the living Word acts through the written Word, and through the Spirit which

> Breathes upon It,
> And brings the truth to light,

it now behoves us to enter upon the consideration of some of the chief particulars in which it is true to say of "The Word of God" that it is unfettered and unbound. For the written Word is the expression of the mind and will of the living Word, of Him Whose "Name is called the Word of God." (Rev. xix. 13.)

The Canon of Holy Scripture, now closed, is the Revelation of the Divine "Logos," who "was in the beginning with God," and "was God." (1 John i. 2.) It is "The sword of the Spirit." (Ephes. vi. 17.) And as the "flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life" in Eden, guarded against the intrusion therein of fallen man, so "the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb. iv. 12.) It will not suffer the admission into the Kingdom of Heaven, even while that Kingdom is still imperfectly developed, unmanifested to the outer world, yet being evolved from the materials still gathering together, but not yet completed, out of which it will finally be constructed,—it will not suffer amongst its members, the "man not having a wedding garment," without the "righteousness of Christ," it excludes from the privileges of the Kingdom, as typified by the "Marriage Feast," whosoever wilfully causeth an offence, or habitually worketh iniquity. Nevertheless, the Word of God is unfettered and unbound in these three respects:—

(I.) It is not bound by any restrictions imposed by its great Author, since it is destined to accomplish the will of God.

(II.) It is not bound by any conventional or social restraints of man, since it is destined to bring the soul of man into harmony with the Divine Will.

(III.) It is not bound by any degree of human

guilt, or by any depth of human depravity, since it is destined to restore man's fallen race. "This is the will of God, even our Sanctification."

(I.) God in His providential but mysterious dealings with His Church on earth—God may permit certain circumstances, to try men's faith, but He has not imposed any restrictions upon the promulgation of His Eternal Word, which "abideth." "It liveth and abideth;" it is as able and as free now to accomplish His sovereign will on earth in the soul of man, His spiritual creature, as when He said "in the beginning," when engaged in the work of the material creation, "Let there be light, and there was light," He

> Whose Almighty Word
> Chaos and darkness heard,
> And took their flight;

He Whose Word, spoken from Mount Sinai, revealed the moral law to man; He, whose Word, the written Word, the Word spoken by the Old Testament Prophets, and by the New Testament Apostles and Evangelists; He who, as "God manifest in the flesh" delivered the Word in His own Person—He Himself made known by the mouth of the Apostle when "in bonds," the grand, the glorious truth contained in the words of my text, the inspired declaration that "the Word of God is not bound." And, if we refer to the Old Testament, did not the inspired Psalmist write:—"Let the people praise Thee, O God, yea, let all the people praise Thee?" And also:—"All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God." And in reference to the Messiah's mission, it was announced by the Prophet Isaiah:—"I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth." And in St. Luke's Gospel, the Word of salvation is declared by Simeon to be "a light for revelation to the Gentiles," a salvation "prepared before the face of all peoples, and the glory of Thy people Israel." Therefore "the Word of God is not bound" by any restrictions imposed by God. He has imposed no limits to its spread, no bounds to its energy. Its influence may extend more rapidly under certain circumstances, it may prevail more at one time than at another, but God Himself has imposed no restrictions upon its operation. There are three considerations, three elements or characteristics of the scheme of Redemption, which in the nature of things necessarily confirm this, which concur in demonstrating this great truth. They show that it must of necessity be true that the Word of God is not bound by any restrictions on the part of its Divine Author, and this once established, the rest must follow. He that is called "Faithful and True," Whose name is called the Word of God," hath also a name written:—"King of kings, and Lord of lords." (See Rev. xix. 11, 13, 16.) The first of these evidences is:—The character of God. The second is:—The end of the Gospel. The third:—The state of man.

The great end of Creation, its design and aim is to manifest the character of God, and to show forth His Glory. Therefore as boundless and illimitable as is the character of God, so free and unrestrained must be the Word of God. For that Word reveals the mind and will of God to His finite creature man. It is the manifestation of the power and wisdom and glory of God, to both angels and men.

At the Creation, in the presence of the Holy Angels, God manifested His Almighty power, when the "morning stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy"; "The Heavens declared the Glory of God"; And God Himself, "saw that it was good." But man is also the work of God. And the end of the Gospel is to display His wisdom and His love. Isaiah declares that "the Word of our God shall stand for ever." (Isaiah xl. 8, and 12—15.) As "in the beginning," "the Spirit of God moved upon the waters," so now, "The Spirit breatheth where it listeth." (John ii. 8, margin, R.V.) It is still working out God's purposes of mercy and of love towards mankind. "It brings the truth to light," and converts the written Word into the Word of Life; the Truth of the Living God, into the Salvation of fallen man. As all-embracing, all-transforming as is the design and end of the Gospel, so all-pervading is the Will, so comprehensive and purifying is the Word of God. Once more, the state of man confirms the truth of the text, that the Word is not bound, that God has imposed no restraints upon its operation, through His Spirit, in the soul. As necessitous and fallen as is the state of man, so infinite is the virtue and restoring power of the Word. No degree of human guilt or depravity can fetter its operation. It was revealed in order that fallen man might renew God's image in which he was created, and that Redemption might vindicate the wisdom of Creation, so that once more the words spoken "in the beginning," might apply to man, "and God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good."

(II.) That the Word of God is not bound by any restraints, whether social, political, artificial, or conventional in their nature, imposed by man, will appear from the history of the progress of Christianity as given in the inspired Word, and as recorded in the subsequent uninspired records of the history of the early Church, of the Reformation period, and of later missionary labours. It will suffice for our present purpose, to note the course taken by the Jewish rulers, elders, and scribes, to hinder Peter and John from preaching Christianity. "They conferred among themselves, saying: What shall we do to these men. . . . . And they called them and

commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in this Name." (Acts iv. 16—18.) But these commands were disobeyed. "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?" (Psalm ii. 1—8.) And when, shortly after, they laid violent hands upon the Apostles, God miraculously delivered them out of prison, and again did they find that they had "taken counsel together" for nought, that it was in vain to "fight against God." It was to no purpose that they again addressed the Apostles with threats and prohibitions, saying, "Did we not straitly command you that ye should not teach in this Name?" (Acts v. 28.) On this occasion, the inspired counsel of Gamaliel prevailed over the impotent recriminations of his colleagues, and the Apostles were again set free, "The Word of God increased," etc. (Acts vi. 7.) Still later, the appearance of the Angel to Cornelius; the vision of St. Peter, and the consequent journeys between Joppa and Jerusalem, undertaken first by the emissaries of Cornelius, and then by St. Peter at their summons and the command of God, resulted in a material influx of Gentiles into the Christian Church. And again, a little further on, we are told that "the Word of God grew and multiplied." (Acts xii. 24, xiii. 49, xvi. 5, etc.) In the xix. chapter we read the account of St. Paul's labours at Ephesus, the site of the temple and shrine of "the great goddess Diana." "And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds." (Verse 18.) At Ephesus the result of the Apostle's teaching and miracles was that "the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified." Exorcists and "users of curious arts" gave up their sorceries and incantations, and destroyed their books to the value of "50,000 pieces of silver." The incident that befell "certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists," coincided with the efforts of St. Paul, to bring many of the idolaters, and the diviners of Ephesus to a better mind; even the evil spirit, who "prevailed against" his would-be exorcists, of constraint bore witness to the truth:—"Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" So that the Word of God was not bound by any conventional, artificial, or civil restraints imposed by man; rather did the powers of earth and of hell yield enforced homage to the Word, and help to accomplish the decrees of Heaven.

III. The Word is not bound or limited by any degree or depth of human guilt, and depravity; the faith which it inspires can break the yoke of every sin, and loosen the chains of every evil habit. On referring to the account given by St. Luke relating to the "beginning of the Gospel," we find proof of this, respecting the character of many who resorted to Christ. "Then drew near unto Him all the publicans and sinners, for to hear Him." (Luke xv. 1, 2.) And in the account of our Lord's call to Zaccheus we see that the voice of the Living Word was the "power of God unto Salvation:" "This day is salvation come to this house!" (Luke xix. 2—10.) So that the Word of God was effectual unto conversion, even in the case of one whose calling was a bye word for fraud, dishonesty, and imposition. That other classes of sinners are not beyond recovery, that the vilest may "repent and be converted," that no degree of human guilt, no depth of degradation can fetter the operation of the Word, or stay the quickening and cleansing virtue of God's Spirit in the heart of man is declared by St. Paul to the Corinthians, of some of whom he knew that their life previous to their call had not been free from the stains of such unrighteousness as was so prevalent in the corrupt city where they dwelt. He first gives a summary of the evil habits in which they had indulged, and a continuance in which, after the preaching of the Word had reached them through his agency, would have shut the door of the "Kingdom of God" upon them, and he adds:—"But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God!" (1 Cor. vi. 9—11, 20.) And St. Paul bears witness in his own person to the power of the Word: "who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." (1 Tim. i. 12—14, 16.)

Thus the Word of God was not stayed in its operation and progress by the manifold guilt of the Corinthians, or by the pride of the human heart, bent on hindering its spread, as exemplified in the case of St. Paul and his erstwhile colleagues, when they sought to stem, by human methods, the working out of God's sovereign will, His purposes of grace, operating by the agency of His Word and Spirit in the world. The New Dispensation, bringing "life and immortality to light," prevailed over the Old; the Covenant of Grace subdued into conformity with the scheme of Redemption the human elements which would fain have strengthened themselves against its introduction, and the dispersion abroad of the adherents of the Gospel, unlike the original dispersion of mankind from Babel, served to contribute to the establishment on earth of another Kingdom, a mightier one than had ever previously existed, that Kingdom of Heaven which Christ and His Apostles preached.

And now comes in the practical application of this great truth to ourselves: let us endeavour to take home to our hearts the important lessons it is pregnant with, for they concern us all, since to all of us the "Word of Life" has "been made manifest." "The life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." (1 John i. 2. R.V.) This Life has been manifested to us in the written Word. And if this be so, is it nothing to you, all

ye that pass by, that this Word is not bound? Is it not rather the will of God, as declared therein, that all men should come to repentance? Is it not His will that the great and precious truths contained in His Word should find an entrance into their souls, that the good seed, the seed of the Word, should be sown therein, and bring forth fruit meet for repentance? Oh, then, let this Word of Revelation sink deep into the good ground of your hearts, that it may bring forth good fruit, some thirty, some sixty, and some a hundred fold!

Again: is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by, that the Living Word, the Eternal Life, the "Word of God," has been made flesh, and dwelt among us in human form, that He might make known to us the will of God, the character of God, the love of God? Will you restrain the progress of the Word, will you stay its operation, either in your own souls or those of others subject to your influence? That influence may extend far beyond what you imagine; but however narrow and circumscribed its radius, will you, by word or action, put a stumbling-block in the way of its reception by a single soul? Oh! what a world of sorrow or of joy may hang upon your response to this enquiry! And knowing this, as you cannot help knowing it full well, will you not rather endeavour to fulfil the injunction which the Spirit of God will enable you to fulfil if you sincerely and diligently seek its guidance, to "let your light shine before men," as those conscious that their mission is to be "the light of the world"? (Matt. v. 14—16.)

Once more, is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by, that the Son of God, who is the "express Image of His Person," whose name is called the Word of God, "who is the brightness of His Father's Glory," came to do the will of Him who sent Him? "Lo, I am come to do thy will, O God." (Heb. x. 7). "By which will we have been sanctified." (ver. 10.) Is it nothing to you, that in obeying that will, in your behalf, the "only begotten Son," hath travailed, hath suffered oppression and affliction for you, that he might recreate you, by His Spirit, and restore in you the Divine image?

Is it nought to you that having been obedient, even unto death, in submission to His Father's will. He hath "overcome the sharpness of death, and opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers"?

Oh, if it is a great and precious truth that God has not fettered the operation of His own inspired, His Mighty Word; that it is still free to accomplish the great Work, the Divine Mission, for which it was sent forth; and if it is a soul-stirring thought that man cannot stand between that Word and the work whereunto He sent it forth, its Holy, its unfailing mission; if it is true, as was well said by a Bishop of the Church, on the appearance of the Revised Version of the New Testament, that "the English Bible has been more than the expected light of the household, that it has proved to be the very symbol of resistance to aggression, the universal and most Catholic bond of the whole English race," if, in one word, it is true, as the history of the English Church during the reformation—to go no further back—has shown it to be, that the Word of God is not bound by any superficial and futile restraints imposed by man; how infinitely more important, how far more comforting is the thought that it is not bound by any degree of human guilt or depravity; that no amount of inborn corruption, of innate and indwelling tendency and predisposition to evil, or of open opposition to the truth on the part of those who "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil," can stay the stream of mercy which flows through the channel of God's word; that though man's transgressions had swollen as we read of old they gathered strength to swell to so great a height, that God said, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth;" and the flood came and destroyed them all: they could not stay the "Word of good tidings," the word which maketh known repentance, faith, and peace by Jesus Christ, from penetrating where no living preacher, save Him who was the "Resurrection and the Life," the "Word Incarnate," had found an entrance. For even they who perished by the Flood, received the "Word," "when the fulness of time was come," received it from the living Word Himself, who, ere He reassumed the human body, in which He had accomplished the will of God on earth, "went and preached unto the spirits "which were in prison," to those "who sometime were disobedient, in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20, iv. 6.)

Though the depth of man's shortcomings, the height of his impiety, were as fathomless as the waters of the Dead Sea, the covenant of mercy, like the sweet vivifying waters of the river Jordan, by the banks of which that covenant was both sealed, and also revealed to man, would penetrate the corrupt abyss, and open to repentant souls a channel of deliverance, even as when God destroyed the cities of the plain, He "remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when He overthrew the cities in the which Lot dwelt." (Gen. xix. 29.)

Let us never forget, that "man's extremity is God's opportunity," and that Christ in the hour of His agony on the Cross, manifested forth His glory, by His utterance of those comforting words to the dying and penitent malefactor;—"This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise!"

Archdeacon Smart, rector of Denbigh, has been collated by the Bishop of St. Asaph to the living of Northop, which had been offered to but declined by the Bishop's second son.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1881.

WE regret that the House of Lords has, under protest, accepted the retrograde and vicious principle of the Irish Land Bill. If the judicial regulation of rents be the *bonâ fide* creed of the Liberal Party, why apply it to land only, concerning which there has been but one "strike" instigated with the avowed ulterior object of repealing the union between England and Ireland, and not to trade, in which there have been thousands of "strikes" and "lock-outs"? The case for a judicial regulation of profits from trades seems to be much stronger and more urgent than for that of the partial profits (rent) from land. However, it is not with the political expediency and aims of the measure that we are concerned, but with its transparent dishonesty and flagrant immorality. We have recently endeavoured to show that in certain Acts of Parliament there is not, as alleged, a State regulation of vice; but if this Bill passes there may truly be said to be a State regulation of covetousness, fraud, and theft. We have always thought that our Bishops had a great national duty to perform in the legislature, and think that on this occasion they might have witnessed for the Commandments of God. Surely a removal of one's neighbour's landmarks, such as this is, ought to have elicited a protest from the bench of bishops. Inasmuch as the Bill is founded on false and unsound political principles as well as on wrong and robbery, we fear that no amount of amendment will make it, in the long run, just and acceptable to either tenant or landlord. It is certain to bring a plague of litigation upon Ireland, which will swallow a considerable portion of the profits of the soil; and it is by no means certain that as a "message of peace" it will abolish political agitation. The Lords' amendments will remedy some of the patent injustices, and we trust that, whatever may be the consequences, they will at all costs uphold them, as founded on the eternal principles of right and justice.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Your correspondent, W. M. Moorsom, states that the opponents of these Acts are convinced that "they recognise, intensify, and render permanent a degradation of one class, which has its rise in causes outside the Acts." The chief of these causes undoubtedly—as the political economist will allow—is the surplus, the superabundant population of our large cities. The census returns prove this. The excess of a million, or say of nearly three per cent., of one sex over the other in a country where the proportion of employment obtainable is altogether in favour of the minority, thus placing the majority at a direct disadvantage, would suffice—in a country even of higher morality than our own—to account in a great measure for the existence of "a special class of human beings" destitute of respectable means of subsistence short of that afforded by the poor-law system.

"W. G. H." thinks that we should feel "most thankful" for the results, without proving what we are to be thankful for, as it is begging the question to say that they have succeeded in putting down vice. Still, we are prepared to acknowledge thankfully when such is the case, and it has been proved to our satisfaction, that "an enlightened Government exercises a just right in checking *by every means* so pernicious an evil;" only I would submit, if an "*enlightened* Government" had endeavoured by every *other* means "to check so pernicious an evil" before resorting to a narrow system of class legislation in this matter, it would not have met with so much opposition, and would have deserved the support of all ranks and parties. As matters stand, opinion is divided on the subject; and while some advocate and support the Acts as *expedient under the circumstances*, others hold that they legalise and encourage a traffic which laws framed on a moral basis would render penal in the same sense as arson and incendiarism.

The present "enlightened Government" has at length seen the folly of attempting to restore prosperity to a country where the soil will not support the people in unfavourable seasons without first endeavouring to provide a safety-valve in the shape of emigration. If it is true that 18,000 girls have been taken from Ireland alone for traffic in vice, one would think that a paternal and "enlightened Government" would have long since suggested such a remedy as they now propose tardily to provide.

But it did not appear from the discussions in the "House" preceding the enactment of these Acts, that any such generous and philanthropical intentions influenced our legislators in the matter. Can they lay claim to any higher motives, than those of expediency, or do they deserve credit for anything more than a desire to lessen the percentage of cases in hospital recruited from our barrack and seaport towns?

Allow that the Acts were necessary at the time, and as being tentative and experimental, not altogether indefensible on sanitary grounds, although, as you admit "exceptional legislation has its objections," surely they have been in operation long enough already to show what they can effect.

The benefit derived from them by "the poor-law patients of the civil population," if any, is local and incidental. The Acts were not passed for them.

The proportionate reduction of the rates levied for sanitary purposes in the Unions included under the provisions of the Acts will hardly be advanced as an argument in their favour, while the country has to meet the expense of working the Acts, the balance of cost being against the economical view, to put it on so low a ground.

And a Government which excludes the systematic teaching of religious truth from Board and State-Aided Schools, can hardly be credited with taking a high moral view of the situation, or congratulate itself on having gone the right way to stem the tide of immorality.

The Government has not—regarded as legislators for the State—at its disposal the agencies necessary for stemming the current of "human passions."

With Canon Butler (in convocation, July 20th) I "do not very much believe in State action in those matters." Nor do I believe that the "Acts" could be justified on moral grounds, any more than the Irish Church Legislation of the same Cabinet. Still less that the Acts are the "only means of tried efficacy in rooting out an insidious poison!"

Aug. 3rd, 1881. CUI BONO.

SIR,—This question has been brought prominently before our notice in yours as well as other of our religious papers. It is naturally one that will be largely discussed, affecting, as it does so deeply, our social state and well-being. Some are anxious to make a compromise with sin for a good purpose. If a false principle can be more productive of good than a true one, then all religion is subverted; but the offspring of evil is evil. And evil forces will assuredly work with the apparent good, and ultimately prevail over it. The only way to eradicate an evil is to tear it up by the roots; if we merely cut it down it will still live, flourish, and put forth branches thicker than before.

To promote what is in itself an acknowledged sin, in order to modify one of its consequences, is surely a false morality. That Christians should advocate this seems strangely paradoxical to the sublime purity of their creed. To examine the question from a material point of view. Those who advocate the Contagious Diseases Act say it decreases disease; that itself is a debated question, which it is unnecessary here to discuss. Be that as it may, all are agreed that it *only* decreases it. This being the case, and on the other hand, if the Act has the effect of causing an increase of numbers to fall into the degrading practice, it follows that the aggregate number of diseased may be as many, if not more. It will increase the moral evil—as can be shewn—and not alleviate the physical. But suppose that it entirely obviates the physical evil, what then of the moral condition? and surely moral disease descends as fatally as physical, and if it increases the moral evil, there is not much to hope for. The only way to prevent physical disease is by sweeping away promiscuous intercourse altogether; by no other means can it be thoroughly eradicated. This indeed would be a vast undertaking, and slow and difficult to accomplish—nor could it be done by any legal measure—but nevertheless the law could modify it if directed against it. It is a hardship that innocent women may have to submit to personal indignity in the carrying out of the law, but that men should escape this, who are the chief defaulters, and who have the power of bringing so much suffering on the innocent, is an injustice as well as a blunder. But worse still, the haunts of vice are made legal. This is giving public and open encouragement to the commission of the sin, and it will have the inevitable tendency of causing the masses to regard it as a natural necessity, and no harm. Thus favoured by opportunity and public opinion, and having no dread of consequences, instead of feeling bound to fight against their evil impulses, they will be sure to yield to them.

It is undeniable that public opinion is one of the most powerful agents we have for good or evil; sins that are looked upon as a public disgrace are not committed as frequently as those that are slurred or glossed over by the world. Experience teaches that the way to put down crime is not by allowing it to be indulged in with impunity. If breaches of the common law were treated thus, where would our civilization be? Yet immorality is not a trivial thing, as it tends so much to the deterioration of our race. A great means of furthering the work of reformation is by forming—as much as possible—societies for prevention, and by publicly and privately denouncing the evil, and shewing the people that it is utterly vile, at the same time inculcating a horror of its fatal consequences, which no device of man can prevent. To induce the people to think it no harm, and that no evil will ensue, is to illimitably retard the wave of progress, and to leave it at a dead level, never to rise above water-mark for many succeeding generations.

AN IRISHWOMAN.

THE REVISED VERSION.

SIR,—My remarks on Mr. Bassett's sermon were not intended for publication, as you are aware, and were written from mere recollection of the sermon. If I have expressed myself incautiously, I hope this will excuse me to Mr. Bassett and your readers. I did not intend to indicate that Mr. Bassett was merely giving an opinion at second-hand. But there is in these days such a *consensus*, without any sufficient evidence, and even, as it seems to me, against probability, touching the language commonly spoken in Palestine in our Saviour's time, that I may be forgiven if I supposed Mr. Bassett to have been influenced by it without having examined the reasons for it thoroughly.

The dimensions of a letter such as you can insert preclude a complete statement of all my reasons for not agreeing with it; but the persuasion I have arrived at is this: that Greek was universally understood throughout Palestine, and was much more the language of the peasantry than English is in Wales. The existence of a Palestinian dialect, such as that of the New Testament, proves this to my mind, inasmuch as *a dialect is never the creation of the mere upper class*. Four translations of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, two of them written specially for the use of Jews and Ebionites, and *after* our Saviour's time, would not have been required, had not Greek been the vernacular language of Jews, and especially of Palestinian Jews, to a far greater degree than either Mr. Bassett or Mr. Nicholson appears to think. For Ebionitism was a Palestinian product.

As the Jewish hatred of Gentilism increased, intensified by two unsuccessful rebellions, these Greek translations went out of use amongst the Jews; and three of them have accordingly been lost, except in a few excerpts. In other words, *Greek went out of*

use after having been much in use. It is therefore anachronistic to take the state of things in respect of language *after* the final destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian as any illustration of the state of things in that respect *before* its destruction under Titus, or during the life of our Lord and of His Apostles. The mind of the nation had changed; and Greek, which had been familiar, was henceforth tabooed.

The whole subject deserves a much fuller and more searching examination than it has hitherto received; and I must repeat my caution against taking for granted that Renan's assumptions regarding it are correct.

Greek lends itself with such ease to the expression of thought, that I cannot see the least improbability in supposing that the Lord's Prayer, however Rabbinical (it may be so in its independent clauses, but not in their combination and as a whole), should have been conceived and uttered in Greek. At any rate, it may have been bilingual from the very first; and this is the more probable, as it was intended for general use.

My argument from the good Greek of the Epistle of St. James has not been noticed either by Mr. Bassett or Mr. Nicholson. To Dean Alford it presented an inexplicable difficulty—a difficulty which my views entirely remove. Ewald, too, was puzzled by it.

As to the notion that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews in Hebrew, and that it was translated into Greek by Luke or Clement, beside the improbability that either they or Apollos or any Greek follower of St. Paul understood Hebrew, I think the following words which I quote from Alford's introduction to that Epistle pretty effectually dispose of it:—

"The construction of periods is such, in distinction from the character, in this particular, of the Oriental languages, that, if it be a translation, the whole argumentation of the original must have been broken up into its original elements of thought, and all its connecting links re-cast: so that it would be, not so much a translation, as a re-writing of the Hebrew Epistle."

I have not seen Dr. Biesenthal's work. But the very mild expression of its reviewers in *The Academy*, that it does not prove its case, is hardly to be taken as a measure of their serious judgment of his theory.

The authority of Clemens Alexandrinus will be taken for what it is worth by those who have read his writings—valuable, of course, from their early date, and from their illustrating more fully than any others do a peculiar phase of thought in the Church: but certainly betraying extreme fancifulness, and an entire absence of the historic, the critical, and the linguistic faculty. The assertion he quotes from Pantænus, must, of course, have been known to Origen: but he knew it only to disregard it. If it had been made on any basis except mere conjecture, we may be sure Origen would not have said, "Who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, God knows."

C. P. REICHEL.

Reviews and Notices.

The August number of THE CHURCHMAN (Elliot Stock) is unusually good, even for that publication. Although the "Churchman" is as yet only twenty-three numbers old, it has already thoroughly established itself as the organ of what may be called the "Original Evangelical Party:" that is, the party holding sound Gospel views strongly, but stating those views temperately and clearly, apart from polemics. The "Churchman" is remarkably free from bigotry, and carefully avoids abuse. The writers in it have piety, ability, and common sense; three qualifications eminently calculated to ensure success. Conducted by Clergymen and Laymen of the Church of England, who are thoroughly acquainted with the topics on which they write, this monthly magazine possesses guarantees against too clerical or too secular views of Church questions, and by its skilful handling of the subjects discussed, creates confidence in the minds of all earnest Churchmen.

The editor is to be congratulated on the tact and judgment he has shown in the selection of both writers and themes in these early numbers of what is likely to prove a great and successful literary venture.

The August number opens with a clear and interesting sketch of "Missions to Merchant Seamen," beginning with the "first floating church, the old sloop of war, named 'The Speedy,' of 400 tons, opened for Divine Service on the 4th of May, 1818." It is startling to read that "of the 38,616 registered vessels sailing under the red ensign, not one bears a chaplain;" and again, "in the Queen's service three-fourths of the fleet have not chaplains:" though in the Navy, happily, the Lord's day has to be observed by law, and the officers who command ships are obliged to act chaplain. Admiral W. A. Baillie Hamilton does good service to the Church by calling attention to the scandalous way in which until quite recently, the Church of England forgot her Spiritual duties towards "souls at sea."

The Rev. J. F. Fenn, B.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, in reviewing the three productions of the text of the Revised New Testament, gives us an insight into the methods adopted by the reviewers, and shows us the niceties of judgment necessary in deciding finally upon the adoption of any one "reading" in preference to others. The care with which great scholars have to balance evidence when estimating the value of an ancient document, should make outsiders lenient in their criticism of the late Revision Company.

The Rev. W. Knight, Rector of Tiverton, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, suggests that the change in the *Sixth Petition of the Lord's Prayer* is not required. He shows the close connection between "Lead us not into temptation" and the *Deliver us from evil.* To *all* people crucial times of temptation may come, and then there is a peculiar fitness in the prayer, Deliver us *out of the evil* inherent in the situation. "Make it a blessing and not a curse." "No less on grammatical than on dogmatical and ethical grounds we are justified in believing that *The Evil* is the particular evil involved in the temptation, itself often neutral, but bad or good just as it conquers or is conquered."

An article on "The Revised New Testament" (third notice) is full of careful comparisons of old and new renderings. Those in the account of St. Paul's shipwreck are most instructive; and prove the immense superiority of the "*New* New Testament."

"Colonel Gordon in Central Africa," edited by George Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L., judging from the extracts given in a review in this August "Churchman," must be a work admirably put together, and intensely graphic.

The biography of "Sister Augustine," a German Sister of Charity, is sure to be widely read; for the brief but vivid outline of her life, furnished by the "Churchman" is most striking.

Reviews of books are not, as a rule, very enticing

to read, but the editor of the "Churchman" has managed to present, under what he calls "Short Notices," a delightful conspectus of books and pamphlets of current interest.

Under the heading "The Month," several leading events of July find a place; and among them is a short summary of the Rochester Diocesan Conference; and copious extracts from the Bishop of Rochester's opening address as President. Weighty and earnest were his lordship's words on the Church difficulties and controversies of the day. His closing sentences may fittingly end our review of this first-rate periodical:—"Lastly, may we not hope, that if not at once, at least presently, we may in some way, and together, make a slight, yet a worthy contribution towards the solving of these serious problems, which are vexing the heart of the Church, and *ought* to vex it, and to which there must be an answer somewhere. How to reconcile suitable independence with lawful authority; how to shape and develop the system of our Church, whether in ceremonial or self-government, so as on the one hand to prevent all reasonable misconception as to letting go primitive doctrine, on the other hand to save a living Church from the stinging reproach of being but a painted mummy-case; how to maintain our proper attitude towards the usurpations and innovations of Rome without falling into the even more fatal peril of a specious but deadly latitudinarianism; how to hold up to the toiling and suffering masses, by the sober and yet ardent ministrations of the Church, the Person and work of the Lord Jesus, as the Hope and life of the world—here is a task, to inflame the coldest and dullest with a noble passion for duty: if this is our ideal, and we come here to help each other towards it, this meeting cannot be in vain.

"For if the Church never had fiercer enemies than now, it is certain she never so little deserved them: and if she had never so many friends as now, she never needed them so much.

"The world is saved or lost by individuals; but I also know that we are all members of one another. We honour God and serve each other by meekness of wisdom and by fulness of Charity."

RURI-DECANAL CONFERENCES.

A Paper read at the Rochester Diocesan Conference.

By the Hon. and Rev. AUGUSTUS LEGGE, M.A., Vicar of Lewisham and Hon. Canon of Rochester.

The Bishop is the ruler of the Diocese; the Archdeacons and the Rural Deans are his officers, appointed to assist him in the supervision of the affairs of the Church in the Diocese. But from the beginning the whole body of Christian men have possessed an inherent right to be consulted and to be heard—a right which has often been imperfectly recognised, often ignored, but which has remained to them still. The laity have a claim to be associated with the Bishops and Elders in their deliberations on matters of interest to the Church. And, indeed, in no other way can the mind of the Church be rightly ascertained. Our Bishop (and we are grateful to him for it) has accepted this principle. He has wished to ascertain the true mind of the Church in his Diocese. He has summoned this Conference in order to listen to the free expression of opinion on the part of the elected representatives of the clergy and laity, and to take counsel with those whom he would rather lead than drive; and the Conference having met, Mr. Gedge has by his motion, if I read it aright, proposed to turn it to practical account. He suggests that it may be made a centre of diocesan work—the nucleus of diocesan organisation. He says, in effect, "If you want Englishmen to meet together and discuss subjects or listen to discussions, you must give them something to do; you must invest them with some power; you must impose upon them some duties. Let them feel that the deliberations in which they are invited to take part are to lead to some practical result; give them a voice in the management of the affairs of the Diocese, and they will come forward readily enough, and will help on the work of the Church heartily." And the object which I have in view in proposing the motion which I have read is to show how the principles which he has enunciated may be extended in their application to the subdivisions of the Diocese.

The organisation of the Diocese is, as I venture to think, incomplete without *Ruri-decanal Conference*. If the Diocesan Conference is to be in the forefront of the Diocesan organisation, it must be supported in its operations by the Ruri-decanal Conferences. What the one is to the Diocese, that the other should be to the Rural deanery.

The subject naturally falls under two heads.

I. *What should be the constitution of the Ruri-decanal Conference?*

II. *What should be its work?*

I. *What should be the constitution of the Ruri-decanal Conference?*

We have it ready to hand. The electors of the members of the Diocesan Conference should be themselves the members of the Ruri-decanal Conference. These, according to our Constitution, would be (*a*) "The clergy lawfully officiating in the rural deanery," *i.e.*, all incumbents and assistant curates, and all other resident clergymen, either licensed or authorised by the Bishop to officiate in his Diocese, together with Chaplains officiating by authority in the Diocese. (*b*) The parish representatives, varying from two to ten in the different parishes in proportion to the population of each. This will give a proportion of at least two laymen to every clergymen, and ensure that the former shall be fully represented. Let me add here how strongly I feel that the constituency for the election of parish representatives should not be one whit narrower than it is according to our present scheme, viz., "All laymen, members of the Church of England, of full age, resident in the parish." This definition guards for every Englishman who is not a declared Nonconformist, the right which he ought to possess of voting for the candidate who would best represent his own views on Church matters in Conference.

II. *What should be the work of the Ruri-decanal Conference?*

I take it for granted that it should meet once in every year. And it should meet for

(*a*) *Business.* (*b*) *Discussion.*

(*a*) *For Business.*—Just as in this Conference we are proposing to appoint committees for various purposes, so by the Ruri-decanal Conference Committees should be appointed to promote Church work generally in the Rural-deanery; to push forward the opera-

tions of the various Diocesan Societies, which have already been called into existence by the activity of our Bishop; to make arrangements for meetings, and services in connection with them, to report the results of their work to the annual Rural-deanery Conference. By this means churchmen generally would become interested in the Church work which was going on around them; they would gain information, which would otherwise never have reached them; their sympathies would be enlisted; their active co-operation secured. We find the germ of such action on the part of the Ruri-decanal Conference, in Rule eight of the Constitution of the Diocesan Society, which runs "Previously to the triennial election of the council, there shall be held in each Rural-deanery, a meeting of members belonging to that Deanery, *to elect a Ruri-decanal Committee*, consisting of an equal number of clergy and laity."

It is my firm hope and belief that such meetings would lead to that unity of action most in accordance with the Spirit of Christ which is essential to the happy fulfilment of the work of the Church in any Diocese.

The Conference having received the reports of its committees would proceed to draw up its own report for presentation to the Diocesan Conference.

(b) For Discussion.—There will always be some subjects of interest to discuss in the Church. How many such there are at the present time our agenda paper sufficiently shows. And so long as there is life in the Church they will not fail.

The proper subjects to discuss in the first instance will be those which are coming before the Diocesan Conference. And for this reason—that so the clergy generally and the parish representatives may have an opportunity of expressing their opinion in regard to the questions under debate; and the members whom they elect will then come to the Diocesan Conference informed as to the mind of their constituents, and will feel that they speak with additional weight whenever they are stating not only their own views, but those also of the Church in their Rural Deanery.

If the Ruri-decanal Conference is to be as useful and as interesting as it ought to be (and unless it is useful and interesting the majority of the members will not attend), then I believe that two principles must be adhered to. *First.*—That any member of Conference should be allowed to give notice of motion on any subject which may legitimately come within the cognizance of the Conference. Members will not be so eager to undertake the responsibility of furthering and speaking to a motion as to make it likely that the Conference will be choked by the plethora of subjects to be discussed; while, on the other hand, those who do propose motions will be those who feel a real interest in the subject which they wish to bring forward, and will know, or think they know, a good deal about it. And so life and reality are given to the discussions, and no one can complain that he has been unjustly overlooked in the selection of speakers, or that subjects of the highest interest have been passed over, while others of little moment have been placed on the paper of business. The members will virtually have arranged the business for themselves, and there must be no fear of burning questions. The very object of the Conference should be to face them, and I can testify from experience on a small scale that the most burning questions may be discussed with such earnestness and yet in such a Christian spirit as to make those who hold most strongly to their own views feel that their opponents are as honest men as themselves, and are equally anxious to do what they believe to be the work of the Church of Christ in the world. Asperities are softened, misunderstandings are removed, men's sympathies are enlarged, and opportunities are given for united action which might otherwise never have been offered. *Secondly*—The rule which has been laid down for this Conference, that every subject should be brought forward in the form of a definite motion to be submitted to Conference, is essential, if the character of the Conference is to be practical. To meet for a discussion which is to end in nothing will never be an attractive thing to Englishmen. The opinion of the Conference generally on each point which has come under discussion must be recorded. That recorded opinion may be passed on in the form of a recommendation from the ruri-decanal to the Diocesan Conference. If the expressed opinion of many ruri-deaneries coincides on any one subject, that opinion must carry weight with it in the counsels of the Diocese, and it will convey to the Bishop in a clear and concise form the mind of the churchmen over whom his spiritual authority extends. We see at once the practical value of the rule requiring subjects to be brought forward in the form of a motion.

To sum up, then, briefly the propositions which I have maintained, they are these:—

1.—The organisation of the Diocese is incomplete without ruri-decanal Conferences held annually.

2.—The members of these Conferences should be the electors of the members of the Diocesan Conference, *i.e.*, the resident clergy and the parish representatives.

3.—The work of these Conferences should be

(*a*) *Business* — Appointment of committees, receiving their reports, reporting to the Diocesan Conferences.

(*b*) *Discussion*—To be made *real* by inviting every member who pleases to introduce a subject; to be made *practical* by proceeding in every case by way of resolution.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bent, Rev. Robert Paul, formerly rector of Tickencote; senior curate of Holy Trinity, Windsor.

Farthing, Rev. George Lax, vicar of Leighland, Somerset.

Gresley, Rev. Roger St. John, perpetual curate of Robarton.

Morgan, Rev. John, vicar of Meliden; vicar of Denbigh.

Palmes, Rev. George, perpetual curate of Hill Farrance.

Pelham, Hon. and Rev. Canon F. G., vicar of Beverley, and chaplain to the Archbishop of York; rector of Halesowen, Worcestershire.

Pennington, Rev. Lewis Theodore, vicar of Englishcombe.

Quennell, Rev. William, vicar of Tring.

Sherard, Rev. Clement Edward, curate of Butleigh.

Smart, Ven. Rev. Edward, rector of Denbigh, archdeacon of St. Asaph; vicar of Northop.

Washington, Rev. Marmaduke, vicar of St. Thomas, Douglas, Isle of Man; vicar of St. George's, Tufnell Park.

Whittaker, Rev. Edmund Juxon, vicar of St. Mark's Lyncombe; chaplain of Magdalen Charity, Bath.

Wyatt, Rev. Gerard Duke, minister of St. John's, Highbury-vale.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Despard, Rev. George Pakenham, B.A., Cambridge, incumbent of Malmsbury, Victoria, Australia, and honorary canon, at Malmsbury, on the 5th May, aged 68.

England, Rev. T., M.A., F.G.S., rector of North Lew, Devon, on the 1st inst., aged 73.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE WORK OF THE PHYSICIAN.

By the Rev. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached before the International Medical Congress in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, August 7th, 1881.

"Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people." —St. Matt. ix. 35.

THERE can be no need for insisting on the importance of an occasion such as the present. No profession touches the outward conditions of human life more constantly, more intimately, than the profession of medicine; and, when the foremost European representatives are assembled, under distinguished auspices, in this metropolis, to examine what their science has hitherto done to relieve human suffering, and decide what, with its present attainments and resources, it may yet hope to do, we are all interested as a matter of course. Heirs as we are, all of us, to the legacy of disease and pain, which comes down to us from the first fathers of our race, we welcome this serious and beneficent effort to review and marshal the accumulated stores of knowledge by which a kindly Providence enables man, not to escape his inevitable doom, but to alleviate, to reduce in area, to keep at bay, the physical suffering which, in the great majority of cases, herald its approach. This great international meeting, where knowledge so precious to the well-being of our race is brought together, inspected, sifted, compared, analyzed, and then consolidated and enhanced, is the common concern of the civilized world; and it is the especial concern of this country, which has not been slow to express, through those who have a right to speak in its name, its sense of the respect and gratitude which is due to its distinguished visitors and to the errand on which they come. At the outset of what I may have to say, it is right once more to note with thankful satisfaction the international character of this great gathering. Nations are the creations of Providence acting in history. They have their frontiers determined, sometimes by the limits of race and language, sometimes by the barriers of seas and mountains; they have, as nations, their distinguishing characteristics for good and evil; and the feeling which binds a man to his country has its divinely-appointed foundations in nature not less truly than that stronger feeling which binds him to his family and his home. But, as the family is greater than the man, and the nation greater than the family, so the human race represents a greatness which altogether transcends that of the nation. Here, in this temple of Jesus Christ, which also bears the name of the glorious Apostle whose life-work it was to break down the walls by which Jewish Nationalism would fain have kept for ever the rest of the world at a distance from its God—here, if anywhere, we may remember that there are truths and duties before which national barriers of feeling rightly disappear. Like those Councils of the Church which in ancient and in more recent days have brought together the representatives of the nations and races parted by the prejudices and the hostilities of ages; like the great heart of the Apostle who, in the unity of the early Christian body, could discern no difference between Jew and Greek, between barbarian and Scythian, between bond and free, so a meeting such as the present rallies the thoughtful and benevolent forces of humanity on a splendid scale — silencing the jealousies, the misunderstandings, the quarrels which too often part and keep asunder even the elect of intelligence and goodness—and in the double name of science and philanthropy presents an array of powerful and well-stored minds such as perhaps never met together before in London, at least for the purpose of doing the best that the modern world can do for the physical well-being of the human race.

Science and philanthropy, did I say? Yes, and it is a combination which at once carries us over an interval of eighteen hundred years to the feet of Jesus of Nazareth, teaching in the Temple and healing the diseases of His contemporaries. In Him, surely, are allied the highest and the largest knowledge and the most disinterested efforts for the physical and moral welfare of man that our earth has ever seen:—"He went about the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, healing every sickness and every manner of disease among the people." Just consider the predominant character of His recorded miracles. If we adopt the common but not altogether satisfactory division of them into works of power and works of mercy, there are of the former thirteen and of the latter twenty-six. Of these last, three are cases of restoration to life, six are cures of demoniacs (forms, these, often of mental disease in which what is physical is mysteriously intermingled with what is moral and spiritual), while seventeen cures that He effected were all cases that might any day have presented themselves for treatment in a London hospital. Not only the blind, the deaf, the dumb, but leprosy, fever, paralysis, incurable weakness, dropsy, an issue of blood of twelve years' standing, a maimed limb, a laceration passed under the tender and healing touch; and, indeed, some of His works of power, as they are called, over nature had a like object with His miracles of healing mercy, as when, to allay human

hunger, He fed the five thousand and the four thousand, and procured a draught of fish where the skill of the fishermen had failed. These single acts, remember, were each of them merely a sample of a habit. We all remember the hyperbolical reference to the number of our Lord's unrecorded works at the close of the fourth Gospel; and such passages as that before us show that the earlier writers of our Lord's life have only selected a few typical specimens of occasions which were very numerous indeed. Times, indeed, there were in His ministry when it might even have seemed that the human body had a greater claim on His attention than the human soul. Such was that occasion which St. Mark describes in the first chapter of his Gospel, when St. Peter's mother-in-law had just been cured of the fever at Capernaum: "And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto Him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed of devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And He healed many that were sick of divers diseases." If we may reverently compare this scene with its modern analogies, it bears less resemblance to anything that occurs in the life of a clergyman than to the occupation of a physician to a hospital on the day of his seeing his out-patients. There is, indeed, all the difference in the world between the best professional advice and the summary cure such as was our Lord's; but we are for a moment looking at the outward aspects of the scene, and it shows very vividly how largely our Lord's attention was directed to the well-being of the bodily frame of man. It would be a great mistake to suppose that this feature of our Saviour's ministry was accidental or was inevitable. Nothing in His work was accidental; all was deliberate, all had an object. Nothing in His work was inevitable, except so far as it was really dictated by His wisdom and His mercy. To suppose that this union in Him of Prophet and Physician was determined by the necessities of some rude civilization, such as that of certain tribes in Central Africa or elsewhere, or of certain periods and places in mediæval Europe when knowledge was scanty, when it was easy and needful for a single person at each social centre to master all that was known of two or three great subjects—this is to make a supposition which does not apply to Palestine at the time of our Lord's appearance. The later prophets, all of them, were prophets and nothing more, neither legislators, nor statesmen, nor physicians. In John the Baptist we see no traces of the restorative power exerted on some rare occasions by Elijah and Elisha; and when our Lord appeared, dispensing on every side cures for bodily disease, the sight was just as novel to His contemporaries as it was welcome. Nor are His healing works to be accounted for by saying that they were only designed to draw attention to His ministry, by certificating His authority to deliver truth; or by saying that they were only symbols of higher work which He had more at heart in its many and varying aspects, the work of healing the diseases of the human soul. True it is that His healing activity had this double value: it was evidence of His authority as a Divine Teacher; it was a picture in detail addressed to sense, of what, as a Restorer of our race, He meant to do in regions altogether beyond the sphere of sense. But these aspects of His care of the human body were not (I repeat it) primary; they were strictly incidental. We may affirm reverently, but with certainty, that *His first object was to show Himself as the Deliverer and Restorer of human nature as a whole;* not of the reason and conscience merely, without the imagination and the affections; not of the spiritual side of man's nature merely, without the bodily; and, therefore, He was not merely Teacher but also Physician; and, therefore, and thus He has shed upon the medical profession, to the end of time, a radiance and consecration which is ultimately due to the conditions of that redemptive work to achieve which He came down from heaven.

"Teaching and healing," this, the motto of our Lord's life, is the motto also of the profession of medicine. It also not merely heals but teaches; it also is, in its way, a ministry and prophecy with truths and virtues specially entrusted to it, that it may recommend and propagate them. It is little to say of this great profession in our time that it is a keeper and teacher of intellectual truth. We all know that it has furnished of late years to literature some of its most enterprising efforts in the way of speculative thought, and the remarkable address with which this Congress was opened will have informed the public generally, while it vividly reminded the audience which listened to it, of the additions which, within the last score of years, medical science has made to human knowledge; additions so vast, so intricate, as to be for the moment well-nigh unmanageable. Of the immense perspectives which are thus opening before it on these high themes, it would be impossible to dwell here; but as a prominent teacher of truth, medical science, I may be allowed to say, has ever powers and responsibilities which are all its own. The physician can point out, with an authority given to no other man, the practical operative force of some of the laws of God. The laws of nature, as we call them, its observed uniformities, are not less the law and will of God than are the Ten Commandments. Knowing that moral law finds its echo and its countersign in this physical world, and is justified by the natural catastrophes that follow on its neglect, it is not the clergyman, but the physician who can demonstrate the sure connection between unrestrained indulgence and the decay of health and life; who can put his finger precisely upon the causes which too often fill, even with strong young men, the corridors, not only of our hospitals, but also of our

lunatic asylums; who can illustrate by instances drawn from experience, the tender foresight of moral provisions, which, at first sight, may appear to be tyrannical or capricious. To be able to show this in detail, to give men thus the physical reasons for moral truth—this is a great prophetic power; this is a vast capacity which we who stand in this pulpit might well envy in its possessors; this is a vast responsibility which they who wield it, like other prophets, must one day account for. The physician can point out, with an authority which is felt to be so real in no other man of science, the true limits of human knowledge. He knows that to-day science is as ignorant as she was two thousand years ago, of what in its essence life is. Of the physical conditions under which life exists, science has, indeed, much that is wonderful to say; and she has, indeed, just been telling us, through the voice of one of her most distinguished sons, that life, viewed on its physical side, is the sum of the joint action of all parts of the human system, of the lower or inferior as well as of the higher or vital parts; that there is no one seat of life, since every elementary part, every cell, is itself a seat of life; and we listen with sincere respect and attention; but we observe that this only states, after all, in language of beautiful precision, what are the points of contact between life and the animal organism. We still ask what life is in itself, and we hear no answer. No; just as science pauses before each atom of matter, unable to satisfy herself whether it be infinitely divisible or not; so, when she has exhausted the skill of the anatomist in endeavouring to surprise the life-principle in some secret recess of the animal frame, she again must pause to confess that the constituent essence of the life-principle itself is a mystery still beyond her ken. And never, never, is science more worthy of her high prophetic duty than when she dares to make this confession. True science, like prophecy, from Moses downwards, knows not merely what she knows but the limits of her knowledge; and when she has attempted, if ever, to forget this, as by him who whispered into the ear of the dying Laplace some praises of his reputation which seemed for the moment to ignore it, she replies with the great Frenchman, "My friend, do not speak of that; what we know is little enough, what we are ignorant of is enormous."

The physician is a prophet, and this character is never so apparent as when life is drawing towards its close. Often, when to the sanguine ignorance of friends the bright eye and the buoyant step seem to forbid serious apprehension, medical science already hears, not uncertainly, the approaching footsteps of the King of Terrors. There is a point, my brethren, at which all forms of cultivated knowledge become instincts, and are certain of their judgments even when they are not able at the moment to produce a reason; and no man can have passed middle age without being struck with the sort of second sight, as it may well seem, which is at the command of a competent physician. Would that I might be permitted, in the freedom of my ministry, to say one word as to the use of this tremendous power. Too often, when science knows that death is inevitable, the dying man is allowed to cherish hopes of life, with a view to possibly prolong, for a few days or hours more, the struggle for mere physical existence, and thus the precious, the irrevocable moments pass during which the soul, by acts of faith and hope and love and contrition, may unite itself to the Divine Redeemer, and may prepare for the presence-chamber of the Judge. It is not for this, brethren, that your higher knowledge is given you; it is not for this that the departed will thank you, when you, too, meet them in the world of spirits.

But the medical profession may also be a great teacher of reverence. Whatever else may be said of our age reverence is not one of its leading characteristics. We have, as we think, explored, examined, appraised, all the sublimities, all the sanctities, all the mysteries which commanded the awe of our less cultivated or more imaginative forefathers, and as a generation we have ceased to revere; and the absence of reverence, depend upon it, is a vast moral loss. What is reverence? It is the sincere, instinctive acknowledgment of a Higher Presence which awes and which attracts the mind that gazes on it. We grow up insensibly towards that which we revere; and to revere nothing is to fall back upon self as the true standard of attainable excellence, and to be dwarfed and blighted proportionately. Now, the profession of medicine should be the apostolate of reverence; for its field of action is the human body, and in no other school can reverence be learned more thoroughly than here. We Christians, indeed, have to speak frankly our own reasons for thinking this. As we contemplate the human body, we cannot forget what our faith teaches us about its origin, about its present purpose, about its coming destiny. We know that the body, like the soul, is from God. It is, perhaps, on earth His noblest visible handiwork. No lines of beauty, it has been said by a great artist, rival those of the human form; no mechanism in any other animal is so perfect. For our part, as we contemplate the human body, we cannot forget its Author. Even if evolution should win for itself a permanent place in our conceptions of the past history of man, it would still leave practically untouched the great question of man's origin. When every step of its progress, continued through ages, has been elaborated by science, the question will still remain—Who furnished the original material, the primal monad? Who gave the impulse which set the principles in motion? Who prescribed the voluntary law?

Who governed its applications? Above all, who must have intervened at some critical moment to endow the subject of evolution with a spiritual and reflective faculty, making him thus visibly to differ, not in degree but altogether in kind, from the creatures that are around him? That which gives to every work of God its first title to interest—namely, the fact that it is His work—confers this title with especial emphasis on the human body. And then next, what is the present function of the human body? We see in it at once a tabernacle and an instrument. It is the tabernacle of the soul. That the soul is distinct from it, that that in us which consciously perceives, wills, acts, which knows itself to be one and identical from week to week and from year to year, while the body is perpetually changing both its substance and its outward mien, this is for us a fact of experience. In order to be certain of it, we do not need a revelation. We know that we cannot understand the function of the body, unless we know something about the functionizing organization; that, for example, we cannot understand the circulation of the blood, unless we know what the heart is, what the arteries, what the veins; but we can understand the intellectual and the moral faculties, we can arrange, we can appreciate them while we are altogether in ignorance of the nature and functions of the brain. In short, we are conscious that the soul, which is the seat and centre of these faculties, is something radically distinct from the bodily organism, which is most immediately related to it, but which is related to it undoubtedly, partly as a tabernacle, and partly as an instrument. The soul inhabits and employs the body. The body is the veil, and it is the interpretation, of the soul. Who does not know how the soul of man speaks through the voice, with its intonations varying from moment to moment, according to the dictates from within? Who has not felt how the soul of man speaks through the eye; how, when the eye is dull and languid, when it is bright and animated, when it flashes forth fire and passion, these are moods of the immortal spirit within? Who does not perceive the eloquence of gesture, especially of involuntary gesture? It also is the language of something infinitely greater than matter and force. We note its successive phases of energy and repose, of suggestiveness and instinctiveness, of conciliation and defiance, and we read in characters that are not to be mistaken the language of the being which dwells within the frame, whose movements it thus controls. More than this, we Christians believe that this tenant of our mortal frame may, and does, become the temple of a life higher than its own; that our bodies are temples of the Eternal Spirit, because He, in a mode which we cannot understand, makes our spirits to be His temples; and thus the human body is, in our eyes, itself precious and sacred; it is an object of true reverence, if only by reason of Him whom it is thus permitted to house and serve. And, again, there is the destiny of the body. As we Christians gaze at it, we know that there awaits it the humiliation of death and decay; we know it will be resolved into its chemical constituents; but we look beyond, we know also that it has a future. Beyond the hour of death is the hour of resurrection; beyond the humiliation of the coffin and of the grave, there is the life which will not die. The reconstruction of the decayed body presents to us no greater difficulties than its original creation; and, if we ask the question how it will be, we are told, upon what is for us quite a sufficient authority, that our Lord Jesus Christ "shall change this vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself." And thus, in this life, the body is like a child that has great prospects before it, and we are interested in, and we respect it accordingly. But you, gentlemen, you, our visitors, you can add to these motives for reverence another, which appeals not to faith, but to experience. It has been finely said that among the students of nature irreverence is possible only to the superficial. You are too conscious of the great powers in whose presence you move and work; of the mysteries above, around, within you; of the magnificent and exhaustless subjects whose fringes you seem only to have touched when you know most about them, to escape from the awe which all true knowledge with its ever present consciousness of a much larger ignorance must always inspire. In this matter science, whatever be her immediate interest, is ever the same, and you can understand with Pascal that the highest effort of reason is to admit that there is an infinity of things which altogether and perpetually transcend you. You can understand our own Newton comparing his first achievements to those of a child playing with the waves as they break upon the sand. The temper of true science is ever the same; and as you move along the awful frontier where the world of matter shades off into the world of spirit, not the least service that you can do to the men of this generation, is, by teaching them the mysteriousness of what they see and what they are, to prepare them to do some sort of justice to what revelation has to say about what they do not see and what they will be.

And, lastly, the profession of medicine is from the nature, I had almost dared to say, from the necessity of the case, a teacher of benevolence. Often we have witnessed the transformation, one of the most striking and beautiful to be seen in life, by which the medical student becomes the medical practitioner. We may have known a medical student who is reckless, selfish, or worse, and we presently behold him as a medical practitioner leading a more unselfish and devoted life than any other member of society. What, we

ask, is this something, akin surely to ministerial ordination, which has wrought this altogether surprising change—which has brought with it such an inspiration of tenderness and sympathy? The answer apparently is, that now as a practitioner he approaches human suffering from a new point of view. As a student he looked upon it as something to be observed, discussed, analysed if possible, anyhow lectured upon, anyhow examined in. As a practitioner he is absorbed by the idea that it is something to be relieved. This new point of view, so profoundly Christian, will often take possession of a man's whole moral nature, and give it nothing less than a totally new direction; and thus, as a rule, the medical practitioner is at once a master and a teacher of the purest benevolence. This is true of those great heads and lights of the profession, whose names are household words in all the universities of Europe, and who have some part of their reward at any rate in a homage which neither wealth nor birth can possibly command; but it is even more true, at least in this country, in the case also of many practitioners of whom the public takes no note, and pre-eminently so in the case of the obscure country doctor whose sphere of fame is his parish or his neighbourhood, upon whom the sun of publicity rarely or never sheds its rays. His life is passed chiefly in the homes of the very poor, and in acts of the kindliest and most self sacrificing service. For him the loss of rest, and the loss of health, is too often nothing less than the law of his work, and as he pursues his career, so glorious yet so humble, from day to day, his left hand rarely knows what his right hand doeth; and yet such men as these, in the words of Ecclesiasticus, maintain the state of the world, while all their desire is in the work of their craft. They pour oil or wine, as can or do few or none others, into the gaping wounds of our social system. They bind and heal, not merely the limbs of their patients, but the more formidable fractures which separate class from class; and unless He Whom with honour we worship on the throne in heaven, is very unlike all that He was 1,800 years ago on earth, such lives as these must be, in not a few cases, very welcome indeed to Him, if only for the reason that they are so like one very conspicuous feature of His own. And here may I add one word? If it is knowledge which makes the profession of medicine so capable of a lofty practical benevolence, must we not hope that this knowledge may not be purchased at the cost of the virtue which it promotes? It would ill become me to attempt to suggest in detail what pathological experiments are necessary or legitimate; but may it not be said that they are only justified, if at all, by some recognised philanthropic aim, as distinguished from the general instinct of scientific curiosity?

Occasions like the present always recall the memories of the dead; and it is impossible not to think of two Englishmen among others who were still living a few months since, and who, had they still been here, would have welcomed, and been welcomed by, this congress with no stinted enthusiasm. If, as having had the happiness of knowing them, I recall their names, it is because in their several ways they illustrate very remarkably those aspects of the medical profession to which your attention has been directed. Of these, the first represented the speculative and scientific rather than the practical side of the profession. He filled with great distinction a chair in his University. He devoted himself with unwearied industry to all that could illustrate the past history of man. He was almost as much at home in the early forms of language as among the skulls and bones which might be unearthed in a Yorkshire barrow; and nothing, nothing, was trivial for a mind which believed firmly in the unity of truth and in the value of all contributions of whatever kind towards attaining it. But that which should be especially recalled here and to-day is his reverent bearing as he traversed that obscure region which divides the physical from the supersensuous world, his resolute faith in immortal existence, his profound sense of overawing mystery everywhere penetrating the great subject which had been entrusted to his care and skill, the child-like consciousness that he was beginning to learn when to others he seemed to be already the master of sciences. Long will the University, long will his country, mourn the late Professor Rolleston. And the other of whom I am thinking, and who was the first to leave us, illustrates by his career no less remarkably the connection between the medical profession and active philanthropy. Whether it was within the walls of Kars, or on the later battle-fields of the Danube, wherever there was suffering, wherever there was oppression and wrong, the quick eye and tender heart of Dr. Humphrey Sandwith were ready for even heroic service. For him medicine was ever the right hand of philanthropy, and his philanthropy was always quickened by a keen sense of social and human distress. Many years, too, will pass before a life so unselfish in its aims as his can pass from memory.

Whatever else may be said of a cosmopolitan occasion like the present, this assuredly must be said of it, its members will not meet again in this life. In a few hours, gentlemen, you will be on your way to all quarters of the civilized world, bearing with you, let us trust, solid additions to the knowledge which you brought us, and cherishing kindly memories of this great city and the English people. But you will never, never, all of you meet again. This solemn thought must surely deepen the sense of responsibility with which you address yourselves anew to the task of influencing the thought of your age, and of promoting its

works of mercy. The two objects are in the last sense strictly one. Never forget that there is a truth beyond and higher than the truths of physics, that there is a better and a brighter world than the world of sense. Of that world our Divine Redeemer did not lose sight when He healed so mercifully the race of this; and medical science will in the long run assert its truest claim to human admiration and gratitude, when it keeps its eye fixed upon those summits of truth to which indeed it may most persuasively point us all, but which we can only reach under the guidance of faith.

CLERICALISM.

By the Rev. CANON RAWSTORNE, M.A., Vicar of Penwortham, Preston.

Sermon Preached at Penwortham on Sunday, December 26th, 1880.

"Let Thy priests be clothed with righteousness; and let Thy saints shout for joy."—Psalm cxxxii. 9.

THE sermon that I am going to preach to you to-day will strike every one that hears it, as being just one week after date. Its subject is that of the two last Advent Sundays; and I wrote it for last Sunday: and then I hesitated about preaching it, because it deals very much with a debateable question of the day. I have a great scruple about introducing such subjects into the pulpit, for I think that pulpits ought to be reserved for higher themes, and to attempt to lift people out of the narrow circle of worldly thoughts, and out of the tempest of ecclesiastical partisanship, into the serener air of the higher world. That thought stopped me for a week; but after further consideration, it seemed to me that it might be useful for a man, who, at least, has the faculty of looking at these matters coolly, to say what he thinks of them. You, too (who, I think, are not much given to ecclesiastical partisanship), will view them calmly and judge for yourselves.

I will make no further preface; but go on, just as if this were an Advent Sermon.

The subject is, the work of the Ministry as set forth on the third Advent Sunday, in preparing the Lord's way; and the work of God Himself, as set forth on the last Advent Sunday, in filling up the defects of the Ministry, and of all other outward means of grace; and chiefly the first of these two things.

It is a subject, which cannot fail to be listened to, for it is actually the most prominent question of the day, not in our own country only, but almost throughout the civilised world. I do not know whether the pulpit is quite the sort of place for a survey of the world around us; but perhaps you may tolerate me for a few moments, while I take a very short and rapid view of the conflict that is going on in the world, for and against the ministry, the clergy, the priesthood—name it as you will.

In France, the question of the position and power of the Clergy is *the* question of the day. The man who was, and perhaps is still, the most powerful man in France, said in one of his speeches, "*Clericalism* is the enemy." And it is in the sense of that aphorism that politics in that country are being directed, and events developing themselves at the present moment. There is a great struggle, which it will take many years to decide finally, whether the Clergy is to rule the Law, or the Law the Clergy.

In Germany, the question is the same. What is called the "Culture-war" means a contest, whether modern enlightenment, inspired by the spirit of the age, and founded on modern science,—or ancient tradition in the hands of the Clergy, shall direct education, and, through it, guide opinion, and rule the nation.

In Italy, the whole national existence depends on the continued triumph of the temporal monarchy, over the clerical (or so-called spiritual) power.

And in the smaller countries, the same battle is being waged. In Belgium, the balance of power on either side is so small that the victory oscillates from year to year, from one side to the other. In Switzerland, too, success is very various, though the balance is greatly in favour of the anti-clerical side.

And here, in England, where sacerdotalism has only been revived within living memory, the question has already reached the stage of actual conflict. Like all other English religious movements for many a past year, the contest is still apparently engaged with surface things; and not one man in a hundred, nor one woman in a thousand, of those who range themselves on either side, sees the questions, great, and deep, and numerous, which lie beneath the surface. But the question most immediately at issue is precisely the same as that debated on the Continent,—whether the Clergy are to rule the Law, or the Law the Clergy.

Then, lastly, in Ireland, the Clergy, allied for the moment with the revolution, which is in principle their most decided foe, have succeeded in laying the Law prostrate: we trust only for a little while.

This phenomenon, when calmly contemplated, is very wonderful. What strange impulse is it that pushes this one question to the front in all these different lands? And from whom does this impulse come? People may name this or that politician, or this or that religious society. But the impulse comes from a higher hand; and is for good, and good will result at last. Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the creation. Known unto Him, and guided by Him, are all these movements of our day.

It is worth while looking at the phenomenon a moment longer.

Here is the ministry or priesthood of the Church —the ministry of reconciliation—those whose feet are said to be beautiful on the mountains, because they bring good tidings, and publish peace —become the centre of the fiercest conflict of the world—erected into an earthly power which politicians have to reckon with, fighting its own battles, attacking and defending, giving and taking blows, of the tongue, or the pen; and sometimes resorting to more material weapons—a body, feared or loved, attacked or supported, on account of the enormous influence that it wields over worldly interests and temporal power.

And this Ministry or Priesthood is, I suppose, in outward order and succession, directly descended from that of the earliest days, whose aim was that unworldly one, which our collect recites in the full spirit of the olden time: "Grant that the ministers and stewards of Thy mysteries may likewise so prepare and make ready Thy way, by turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that at Thy second coming to judge the world we may be found an acceptable people in Thy sight." How little do the efforts of the Church or Clergy, in our day or in any day, seem to contemplate the speedy coming of the Lord. Just as in secular politics, so in ecclesiastical, every earthly influence is weighed and valued, every possible adherent counted and marshalled. There are agitations, canvassings, demonstrations, articles, advertisements, to influence opinion. Everything is calculated to act on the fashion of this world, as if that were not to pass away, and as if no actor might be expected to appear, except those who are actually visible upon the stage. The things most wanting to ecclesiastical disputants are that calm confidence in the future, which belongs only to those who trust in God, and a glimpse, however light and transient, of the world unseen.

Why should these contentions exist with regard to the ministry, or (to call it by its modern name) the clerical profession, and to none of the other professions? There is nothing similar, that I know of, in any other profession—no quarrels between professional men (as such) and those who are the objects of their skill and care—none such, for example, between the patients and the doctors, or between the clients and the lawyers. Individual complaints, of course, there are, about neglects, or mistakes, or fees, or bills; but nothing like a general resistance to a whole profession.

I am going to try to trace the causes of this phenomenon. I will confess that it is, perhaps, the most presumptuous effort that ever I made. And I cannot be too confident of the answer that may result after all. But it is a subject on which persons in my profession are constrained to think, and which it is good for others to reflect on as well. So let us ask—whence comes this mutual repulsion and distrust? Why do the bodily sick almost always run after the doctor, and the spiritual patients so often fall into violent variance with the professed physicians of their souls?

1. I think the most fundamental of all the causes is the affectation of supernatural power, from which hardly any ministry or priesthood is free. This pretension to supernatural enlightenment and authority is met by a strong suspicion that such claims are untrue, and those who make them insincere. The desire that has developed so immensely in our age, to surround the priesthood with ceremonies and decorations, tends very greatly to increase this suspicion of unreality. It is patent to everybody, that those professions which are doing a real work, tolerate but little ceremonial. There was a time, when the Doctor of Medicine had as many paraphernalia as a Divine; and had a regular routine with all cases, like that ridiculed by Molière and Le Sage, curing, or perhaps killing, but always acting "*selon les règles*," "*secundum artem.*" All that is quite gone. A doctor, who tried to envelope himself in ceremony, would be set down at once as a charlatan; as he would no doubt be. All medical subjects are submitted to the freest investigation: everything is reduced to bare scientific truth, and mere reality.

In the Law, some Ritual still lingers, through ancient usage, through that conservatism, which sits well upon the ancient and dignified profession; but no lawyer would think of inventing a new ceremony, or reviving an obsolete one. There, too, there is a gradual process of free research, and progressive improvement. There is a proving of all ancient things, and a holding fast only of those which are good.

You see—these professions are real. Medicine often cures men's bodies—sometimes perhaps kills them, but in either case has real tangible effects upon the patients, and a real influence on life or death. And Law does detect crime, and vindicate the rights of things; not infallibly, no doubt, but still in a very real way.

But, if the Ministry of Religion is to retire behind a pomp of scenery, and dress, and ceremony, does it not seem as if it were profoundly conscious of its own unreality? If instead of imitating the severe simplicity of those professions in which a real work is done, it borrows the properties of the stage, will not the question arise in men's minds—Is it not an illusion, as its model is? Has not that question arisen in thousands of minds already? When they see the sufferings of our Blessed Lord converted into a drama, and that made into the most fashionable spectacle of the day, the thought cannot fail to rise—Is this, then, a drama, like that (for example) which Shakespeare has constructed out of the death of Julius Cæsar? Are these sorrows, after all, only to be classed with the heart-searchings

of a "Hamlet," or the mental agonies of a "King Lear"—as splendid creations of human intellect and imagination; but nothing more?

And, to quote another example, when the simple Supper of the Lord is transformed into a gorgeous function, in which a piece of bread is exhibited for adoration, as present Deity, and all possible materials of splendour are introduced to symbolise and decorate that idolatry, does not the thought rise unbidden in the mind that the whole thing is unreal and untrue? And is not, in too many cases, Christianity itself cast off along with its perversions?

I believe that this is the pit-fall towards which the straining after religious novelty and effect is conducting the public mind.

The Ministry of souls must condescend to be a real profession, such as its sister professions are. It must put off the affectation of non-existent supernatural power, with all that tends to foster that delusion. No reason, then, why that Ministry should not practise in mental, and moral, and spiritual pathology, as freely as any doctor on the diseases of the body, enjoying the confidence of every human being to whose conscience it might commend itself in the sight of God. No reason, then, why it should not direct a worship, not arranged to act upon the senses, but to aid reasonable beings in approaching God.

2. The other chief cause of the frequent conflict of the Clerical with the Lay Power and the Law is, I think, the centralised organization which all the Priesthoods, and all the Churches, more or less affect. I believe that the looseness and weakness of our Church's organization was one of the chief causes of the great harmony that existed in it, between the clerical and lay element, in days gone by.

A Church with a feeble organization leaves so much scope to individual liberty, and has so little aggressive power, that it is neither feared nor hated. On the other hand, a Church with a strong organization, is, like a great standing army in the material world, a standing menace to its neighbours. The reason why the Church of Rome has been, and is, so much more hated than any other Church, is that it is so much more feared: and the reason why it is so much more feared is, the enormous strength of its organization, which is, as an instrument of earthly power, the strongest thing that the world contains. And the Jesuits, the regiment of *élite* in the Roman army, in which organization, training, and discipline are carried to the greatest perfection imaginable, have concentrated upon themselves thereby the greatest share of power, of fear, and of hatred. It is the existence of that tremendous organization which provokes all these conflicts abroad. Those who love liberty hate the Clergy with a hatred which is chiefly composed of fear: and strike at them, often blindly and at random, through wrong as well as right, but with a true instinct that that must be liberty's most deadly enemy, which cannot tolerate the freedom even of mind and thought.

A strong centralised organization, formed more or less on the Roman model, is the ideal of all the ecclesiastical statesmen of our day. They must organize, they think, in order to surpass the rival Churches or sects, and, undoubtedly, if such a victory be the main object of a Church, they have chosen the right way of gaining it. Victory, in Church contests, rests, usually, not with the truest doctrine, but the strongest organization: just, as in secular warfare, it favours most often, not the best cause, but the heaviest battalions. But are such victories the highest aim of Churches? Are there not better things?—the leading back of sinners to God—the medical treatment of sick souls—the diffusion of light, virtue, peace, and happiness?

A man might go on with a subject so interesting as this till he had produced a book instead of a sermon. I will try your patience no longer, for I believe that I have pointed out the two chief causes of the ecclesiastical wars and fightings that occur around us. Let me recall them to your minds once more.

One is the pretension to supernatural power on the part of the Clergy, aided by those outward paraphernalia whose object is to suggest the idea of supernatural powers and miraculous transactions. These pretensions revolt men's instinctive sense of truth, and will be, as they ought to be, opposed.

The other is the almost worship of organization which now prevails. In many clerical circles it is treated as the one thing needed; and numbers engage in it with some success who have not on their lips or in their minds the slightest vestige of a word from God to speak.

I think we should discourage these too great efforts after organization. It is a thing good for war, but bad for peace; good for power, but bad for liberty.

And now we have devoted a whole sermon to reflections on a subject of the day. And that is an act which I always think needs apology. For our pulpits were entrusted to us with the higher aim of preparing for the world to come. And if we forget that aim, even in one single discourse, our own Collects and Epistles and Gospels all rise up to condemn us. My only excuse is, that such things happen very seldom, and perhaps now there may be an occasion for something of the kind.

And these matters of the day, equally with the ages of future eternity, all lie in the hands of the Higher Power, whom we specially invoke to-day. We say, "O Lord, raise up Thy power, and come among us, and with great might succour us." Every contention rises with His permission, and is guided by Him to an end which He has foreseen and chosen. As Isaiah says, in his Master's name, "I am Jehovah, and there is none else;

there is no God besides me . . . . forming light, creating darkness, making peace, creating evil. I, Jehovah, am the doer of all these things."

Yes, Jehovah alone is the doer of them all.

I know an illustration, which seems so fitted to contrast man's fussy and feeble activities with God's tranquil yet irresistible providence, that I will choose it for my conclusion.

A long time ago I remember reading, in some of the older Arctic Voyages of the days of Captain Parry, how that voyager conceived the idea, which has been acted on in later times by Captain Nares, of travelling with sledges upon the frozen surface of the Arctic Sea, and so reaching the North Pole. He chose the eastern side of the Arctic regions towards Spitzbergen and Nova Zembla: and his travelling party disembarked on the ice-floe, which seemed as if it might extend unbroken to the Pole. They had their boat, and their sledges, and their other impediments, and travelled for some days with great labour over the uneven surface of the rough, hummocky ice, making a few miles' progress each day towards the north. But every time that the sky was clear enough to take observations for latitude, they found themselves no nearer the Pole, but always a little further *south*. In fact, while they had been pushing on with inconceivable labour towards their object, the North Pole, the whole mass of ice on which they were travelling had been drifting constantly the opposite way, southwards.

I think that describes wonderfully the Church movements of our time. While the divines are laboriously toiling after their self-chosen objects, and fussing about their little activities and agitations, the whole stratum of thought and opinion, on which they and we are living and moving, is floating another way, none knows whither; and none of us can any more guide its course than those voyagers could steer the ice-floe. But as that frozen field, in its enormous mass, is moved by an invisible current formed by the God of Nature, so is the thought and opinion of ours, as of every, age. And we believe in that same living God—not in a fetish which a priest may exhibit for our worship, not in a dogma which a theologian may formulate for our acceptance; but in the living God—the God of Abraham, and Moses, and David, and Isaiah, and of Jesus Christ—the God of Nature and of Providence, who has made the laws which rule the orbs of heaven, but without whom not a sparrow falls—the God of Revelation, who spoke in time past to our fathers by the Prophets, and hath in the latter days spoken to us by His Son—most of all the God of Jesus Christ, who is a Father—His Father and our Father, His God and our God—the God of Jesus Christ, who is love. It is He that is guiding thought and opinion. It is He that is directing the currents and the spirit of the age. And if it be true that the whole surface on which we live, and beneath which our bones must soon be laid, is drifting—drifting and melting—surely it is not so great an effort to believe that it is drifting, like the ice-floe, towards the sun—towards the central focus of warmth, and light, and life, towards the Sun of Righteousness; and that if it melts it shall be into that sea of glory which shall spread from pole to pole.

How familiar are those two or three last words, and the hymn which contains them! Surely neither they nor the words that follow are a mere poetic dream:—

> Till o'er our ransomed Nature
> The Lamb for sinners slain,
> Redeemer, King, Creator,
> On earth returns to reign.

The heavens have received Him, till the time of the restitution of things. And towards that great event are moving all the tides and currents and winds of God. "O ye seas and floods: O ye light and darkness: O ye winds of God: bless ye the Lord, praise Him, and magnify Him for ever." And that is precisely what these influences always have done from the beginning, and are doing now, and never can for a moment cease to do, even to the end.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1881.

THERE is much in "Cui Bono's" letter in last week's issue with which we thoroughly agree. Government can promote female emigration, and can insist upon the systematic teaching of Bible-truth in State-aided schools. It cannot "stem the tide of immorality or the current of human passions;" but we hold that it can and does, by means of the Contagious Diseases Acts, to a certain degree, prevent the spread of an insidious poison. Although we are directly at variance as to the aim, provisions, and actual results of the Contagious Diseases Acts, we are in full accord with the admirable spirit and intentions of "An Irishwoman." If she will peruse our previous articles she will find that we hold with herself and Miss Martineau that vice or sin is the parent of all

disease. She will also learn that the Acts do not give a license of any kind to either the persons or haunts of prostitutes. What we meant by trading in vice was practising it for *pecuniary* profit. It cannot be said that men do this. All our younger soldiers and sailors are, we believe, periodically examined with a view to prevent the spread of disease, so that under these Acts the two sexes are placed, as nearly as circumstances will allow, on an equality. The suggestion that it should be made illegal for a man to marry when suffering from syphilis is most valuable. The supporters of the Acts are liable to the reproach of not endeavouring to extend them to the whole population. We wish it could be effected, but the opposition to the limited Acts is so loud and strong that we feel that it would be impossible, at present, to induce the legislature to extend them. It is said, and we believe with truth, that one association for the repeal of them, out of many, expends £10,000 yearly in agitating for their repeal, so that it is no easy task to maintain them. If it can be done, surely it rests with the opponents to propound a scheme of legislation that will more effectually promote the morality and health of the nation. We will welcome such a measure, but meanwhile it is incumbent on us to urge all parties to examine for themselves the actual working of the present Acts, when it will be found that they not only "heal the sick and cleanse the lepers," but very plainly and practically "preach the Kingdom of Heaven." Publicity and exposure, in all seriousness, of this wide-spread disease and terrible social evil is the only way in which we can help to promote its cure. We therefore thank "A Surgeon" for his well-reasoned and instructive letters. We do not at all believe, with "An Irishwoman," that the maintenance of the present Acts "will *immeasurably retard* the passing of a far more just and universal measure, for if disease is admitted to be ameliorated, too many will be therewith content, and won't trouble themselves about the moral evil, and Government will see no necessity for further action in the matter." This may prove a radical and effective, but it certainly is an immoral argument. In effect it says, Let us give vice, prostitution, and disease free play amongst our soldiers and sailors; let us tolerate street solicitation and notorious brothels, in order that the subject, like the Irish Land Act, may again be brought within the range of practical politics, and some more heroic and radical measure be enacted. Is not this doing evil that good may come? Inasmuch as the total extinction of moral evil is said to be the object, we hold that this policy is fallacious, because vice, disease, and debility breed and promote immorality in the next generations. We sorrowfully admit this policy has *for the moment*, owing to the weakness of our legislators, proved successful in Ireland. We have and always shall charge Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues with having encouraged, by word as well as by deed, the Fenians and Land Leaguers to commit heinous crimes in order to induce Englishmen to sanction the spoliation and robbery of the landowners as forsooth a message of peace to the Irish tenants! The nemesis will assuredly come, because Society cannot afford even to forgive, much less to compensate, the trespassers against it.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—There are a few more points that may be noticed in reference to this debated question. Many who oppose the Contagious Diseases Act, oppose it solely on account of its restricted use. It really goes but a short way towards *stamping-out* disease and vice, as it applies only to a small minority. Objectors would advocate a far more sweeping and wholesale eradication of the evil, *i.e.*, the application of the Act also to men. All the arguments in favour of the Act as it now exists will necessarily apply to its extension in a greater degree. Many of those who make a great outcry against its suppression, and advocate it so strongly on sanitary grounds, maintain a strange silence on the point of its being directed against men. If so beneficial in one case, how much more so in the other, when the numbers that incur the risk are so much greater? This would neither be hopeless or impracticable if urged by those who now clamour so pressingly for the restricted measure. The comparison about the adulteration of food is not exactly a parallel case, for the objectors are above all things desirous to cleanse the land from adulteration, but they wish to effect a radical cure by destroying the primary cause; in fact, they "aim at rooting out an insidious poison by the only means of tried efficacy"—besides, the drunkard will drink to excess if he gets the purest alcohol, and the glutton will gorge if he gets the most delicate and *recherché* condiments. Again, it is to be feared that those who listen to anything so offensive as street solicitation will be capable of deliberate action in the matter. The Act is only a deterrent in a narrow sense, affecting as it does a certain part of the community who are happily a small minority; its tendency is undoubtedly to encourage immorality amongst men. Several cases—and those by no means exceptional—of men being deterred through fear of disease, have been known to the writer, especially relating to young men about to enter professions for which a physical examination is necessary, and the fact of subjected women petitioning Parliament is only what is to be expected; for the evils consequent to their mode of life are ameliorated by the Act, and they have also the advantage of a license, which is the most odious feature in the case. Could not supervision be exercised without this? It should be remembered that the "*trade of vice*" is carried on by *all* those who are guilty of the error in question. So long as women carry on this trade their social and moral improvement is but an empty name.

Of the two evils, let us strive by all means to sweep away the greater and more widespread one of immorality, and then its consequence—disease—will be

eradicated. There is every reason to believe that what appears to be the most appalling form of disease has been generated by vice, as well as transmitted by it to posterity. But there are infinite forms of disease that are not discernible, for it affects the whole machinery of our frame in all the various stages between predisposition and actual development. A child, apparently sound, may communicate syphilis to another by means of vaccination. A person to all appearance healthy may have the seeds of consumption, which will not exhibit itself until after maturity, and it is well known that vices other than prostitution sow the seed of corruption which also descends to posterity. Harriet Martineau, whose extraordinary genius was eminently scientific, being perhaps the greatest political scientist of her day, and the most statistical of beings, opposed the Contagious Diseases Act, for she considered that it lowered the moral tone of the nation by acknowledging vice to be a public necessity ; that it also established it on a firmer footing ; and that vice itself being the parent of disease, where one exists the other must follow.

I am far from saying that the Contagious Diseases Act, as it at present exists, is not in some respects highly beneficial, but there are three objections that still remain, as has been already said. The moral tone of the nation is lowered ; among men immorality is encouraged rather than otherwise ; and the passing of the measure in its present imperfect state will *immeasurably retard* the passing of a far more just and universal measure, for if disease is admitted to be ameliorated, too many will be therewith content, and won't trouble themselves about the moral evil, and Government will see no necessity for further action in the matter. It appears that the *creed* of Christianity alone is not sufficient to meet the difficulty, for as Canon Rawlinson said the other day in Convocation, Christian London is as backward as pagan Rome in some respects. Theory or preaching alone will not do. Practical measures will have to be enforced. Let a measure be advocated to which the objections above mentioned are not applicable, which is wider in its application, and more beneficial in its results, viz. :—That there should be no license for the haunts of vice ; that the supervision that women are now obliged to undergo should be extended to men ; above all, that it should be illegal for a man to marry when suffering from that "foul leprosy."

AN IRISHWOMAN.

SIR,—In my last letter, which you kindly published in your impression of the 6th inst., I endeavoured to show (I trust successfully) that much of the opposition to these Acts arose from confusing together two things which ought to be kept separate. It is one thing to cure or prevent these diseases ; it is quite another to provide facilities to vicious persons for safe indulgence. I also wished to disclaim that the moral question is indifferent to me, and those who support these Acts. I will now, with your permission, ask your readers to consider another question with me. I assume that all who have sons, male relatives, and friends whom they dearly love would rather that they kept themselves pure. But if they yielded to temptation is it a matter of indifference to their parents whether they contract disease or not? Surely the most bitter opponent of these Acts, or the sternest moralist, will hardly answer Yes. But I must go further. Is it a matter of indifference to fathers and mothers whether their future sons-in-law are free from or tainted with a disease which they may communicate to their future wives and children? That this is a real and not imaginary case is well known. Let us see why.

Syphilis, the more serious of these contagious diseases, has prevailed more or less in Europe for centuries past, breaking out with greater or less violence under certain circumstances, such as war and famine. Now in other countries ample hospital accommodation has been provided for this and kindred diseases ; not so in England. Our principle has been to ignore these diseases, and, when this was no longer possible, to relegate them to workhouses and the "foul wards." Lock hospitals are only to be found in a few of the largest towns and cities, have little accommodation, and are miserably supported by the public, who are only too ready to avail themselves of the wretched old cuckoo cry, "Oh, we must not encourage immorality." And so we are now reaping the whirlwind, our fathers having sown the wind with a vengeance. In all our large towns and cities for years past a number of women have been allowed to propagate these diseases wholesale to all with whom they came in contact, and from them to innocent women and children. You, Sir, have shown, in your first able leader, how prevalent these diseases are, but it would be impossible for anyone to give an idea of the extent of the evil. Could this be done, we should hear no more of opposition.

Now, it is very easy for persons with a limited knowledge of the subject to write and say that these Acts have not reduced disease, but it has been proved beyond all dispute before a Royal Commission, a Select Committee of the House of Lords, and two Select Committees of the House of Commons, that these diseases have been considerably reduced in the army, navy, among the women subject to the Acts, and in the civil population where they are in force. Moreover, and this is most important, it has been clearly shown that the mortality from syphilis has been appreciably less in those counties where the Acts are in force than where they are not, taking every care that the comparisons are fair.

As there is much ignorance as to where the Acts are in force, I will give a complete list of the localities :—In England : Aldershot, Canterbury, Chatham, Colchester, Dover, Gravesend, Maidstone, Plymouth, and Devonport (including Dartmouth), Portsmouth, Sheerness, Shorncliffe (including Walmer, Deal, and Folkestone), Southampton, Winchester, Windsor, Woolwich. In Ireland : The Curragh, Cork, and Queenstown. In these places the Government have provided and supported hospitals with six hundred beds for females only, and I may fairly ask the opponents of these Acts to consider what the effect of closing them would be. I may inform them at the same time that all the voluntary Lock hospitals in the whole kingdom provide an accommodation barely equal to the six hundred beds provided in the limited area to which these Acts are applied. Hence, I say, that Government has done what philanthropy has failed to do.

16th August, 1881. A SURGEON.

The Rev. E. Leslie Goodwin, a son of the Bishop of Carlisle, has accepted the curacy of Faversham, vacant by the appointment of the Rev. H. E. Curtis to the chaplaincy of the almshouses.

Reviews and Notices.

"PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS ON EVERY VERSE OF THE HOLY GOSPELS," by a Clergyman. Second edition; with a Preface by H. P. Liddon, D.D. Rivingtons. 1881.

Dr. Liddon stands sponsor for this book, because any book, "if it have not the guarantee of a name, makes its way under a disadvantage." We are told "the author's name is withheld for reasons which those who know him will easily understand." Perhaps the dedication of the volume may help to throw light on the question of authorship. "To the Rev. Edward Francis Russell, M.A., Assistant Curate of S. Alban the Martyr, Holborn, these reflections are inscribed in love and gratitude." These *Reflections* are for the benefit of those who, in Dean Burgon's words, "resort to Holy Scripture neither to criticise its historical statements, nor to acquaint themselves with its linguistic difficulties, nor yet to have its hard places explained to them. They read the Gospel chiefly for their souls' health." The compiler disclaims originality, and candidly tells us he has freely used "Reflections Morales sur le Nouveaux Testament," by P. Quesnel. The plan and building up of the book are good. The verses are printed right across the page, and under them the notes, reflections, pious ejaculations and moral musings are printed. So that the eye is not obliged to search for information at the bottom of the pages, which refers to printed matter at the top.

It is very pleasant to be able to travel straight on, in reading a book of this kind. But whether in these days of criticism and sifting, so large a volume of *mere meditations* is needed, in addition to the flood of pious commentaries already around us, is a matter difficult to decide. However, the "Reflections" have reached a second edition, clearly showing that good people still exist, who like to give their brain an entire holiday when studying the Bible devotionally.

Still it must be hard to feel devotional about "*Every* Verse in the Holy Gospels." Even the writer is obliged to content himself with only one note of religious platitudes for all the verses in St. Luke iii. beginning "*Which was the Son of.*"

Religious Freedom.—Mr. Paxton Hood, the Congregational minister of Manchester, has been "driven forth," as he says, from his chapel, by the tyranny of his deacons, and has gone to America. At a farewell gathering, when he was presented with a purse of £200, he made the following comparison between the freedom of the Church of England and the tyranny to which Dissenting ministers are subjected. Mr. Hood said:—"The Church of England to him was the shrine and home of spiritual and ecclesiastical freedom. They might laugh at him if they would, but he said none of the sects were free, and amongst most Dissenting communities the ministers were too dependent upon their deacons for them to dare to be independent. From whence came our best books, from whence did we obtain the books which stirred, which taught—the books of criticism and exegesis—the books of the scholar, the poet, and the novelist? Did they come from any Dissenting community at all; especially did they come from theirs? Did they not come from the Church of England? And where could a man stand so well as in a Church of England pulpit and say that which he dared to think and feel without the necessity of being challenged, as soon as he got into the vestry, by some arrogant and ignorant deacon?"

The Contagious Diseases Acts.—The Select Committee have decided to report the evidence adduced before it to the House of Commons, and to ask that it be reappointed next session. We have read, with much pleasure, three leading articles in the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, which deals very effectively with the fallacious arguments of the opponents of these Acts. A number of letters has followed; and it is significant that, with two exceptions, all are in favour of the Acts. Now that so clear and convincing evidence has been given by the Revds. E. P. Grant and Dr. Wilkinson, as to the moral and social benefits conferred upon the women brought under the influence of the Acts, the clergy of the Church of England should see that the subject is no longer one of controversy, but comes within the inexorable logic of facts.—*British Medical Journal.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barnes-Lawrence, Rev. Ashley Lawrence, curate of Christ Church, Brighton; vicar of Thornes, Wakefield, Yorkshire.
Beesley, Rev. Thomas Brasher, curate of Bibury, Fairford; vicar of Ruardean.
Bicknell, Rev. Charles Vincent, curate of St. Luke's, Old-street, E.C., vicar of Good Easter, Essex.
Bullen, Rev. John, rector of Southam, Warwickshire.
Curgenven, Rev. John, curate of Lyme Regis; rector of Rousdon, Devon.
Dunfield, Rev. H., assistant-curate of St. Thomas's Church, St. John's, Newfoundland.
Foster, Rev. C. H., S.P.G. missionary at Trinity West, Newfoundland.
Hammond, Rev. Joseph, vicar of All Saints', Pontefract; vicar of St. Austell, Cornwall.
Holland, Rev. C. W., curate of Bonne Bay, Newfoundland.
Love, Rev. Edward Hough, curate of Dunstable, Beds.
Mason, Rev. P. Pearson, vicar of Edstaston; vicar of South Malling, near Lewes.
Middleton-Wake, Rev. Charles Henry, formerly vicar of Lingen, Hereford; assistant-chaplain in the Chapel Royal, Savoy.
Payne, Rev. C. L., S.P.G. missionary at Portugal Cove, Newfoundland.
Shaw, Rev. G. A., rector of Aston Sandford, Thame; vicar of St. Michael's, Derby.
Targett, Rev. James, curate of Littleton, Staines; rector of Falfield.
Whyley, Rev. F., vicar of East Cowes; vicar of Alton, Hants.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Buller, Rev. Antony, formerly rector of St. Mary Tavy, at Pound, Horrabridge, on the 13th inst., aged 71.
Collison, Rev. H., at Bilney Rectory, Litcham, Norfolk, on the 13th inst., aged 89.
FitzWygram, Rev. John, vicar of New Hampton and rural dean of Hampton, suddenly, at Ilkley, Yorkshire, on the 13th inst., aged 54.
Fox, Rev. Octavius, M.A., rector of Knightwick, Worcestershire, at Folkestone, on the 5th inst.
Proctor, Rev. George, D.D., eldest son of the late George Proctor, Esq., of Clewer, Berks, for many years rector of Hadley, Middlesex, at Welbeck-street, London, on the 7th inst., aged 85.
Randall, the Ven. Henry Goldney, M.A.: rector of Christian Malford, Wilts, and archdeacon of Bristol, after a very short illness, on the 7th inst.
Scott, Rev. John Arthur H., M.A., vicar of Portfield, Sussex, on the 4th inst., aged 47.
Wanklyn, Rev. Edward, at St. Michael's Vicarage, Bournemouth, on the 11th inst., aged 45.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SPIRITUAL CHURCH-BUILDING.

By the Rev. CANON RAWSTORNE, M.A., Vicar of Penwortham, Preston.

Sermon Preached at Church-Kirk at the Re-opening of the Church after Restoration, on Sunday, August 14th, 1881.

"And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies, that the king said unto Nathan the prophet, See now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the Ark of God dwelleth within curtains. And Nathan said to the king, Go, do all that is in thine heart; for the Lord is with thee. And it came to pass that night, that the word of the Lord came unto Nathan, saying, Go and tell My servant David, Thus saith the Lord, Shalt thou build me an house for me to dwell in? Whereas I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle. In all the places wherein I have walked with all the children of Israel spake I a word with any of the tribes (judges, *marg.*) of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people Israel, saying, Why build ye not Me an house of cedar?"—2 Sam. vii. 1—7.

ONE of the great advantages arising from Old Testament lessons is, that the human life which they depict, while different in all its outward colouring and form, is the same in all its inward nature, as that in the midst of which we are living now. The specific aims or objects of our own period, the technical terms, the local and party names, the personal feelings and prejudices, are all absent; but the principles are all present, and with them the good which we have to seek, and the evil which we must avoid. Now we have had, in the last few Sundays, a series of lessons in which the origin and progress of Solomon's great Temple were described; and to-day we had the story of his worldly splendour, and of his moral decline. For regular church goers, such as I trust all of you are, the subject will be very fresh in mind, and therefore fit to be treated as a whole; and as such, I think it will be the fittest subject for such an occasion as the present.

We, in our day, call a house erected for purposes of divine worship a church, and not a temple; and the ceremonial of our age is as different as it well can be from that of King David's time. But the principles which should guide the projectors of such edifices are the same in every age. And a pamphlet written specially to advise and correct the church-building of our age, would not be half so interesting or persuasive as these old chapters about David and Solomon.

Now Church-Building and Restoration is one of the most striking features of our day; and no person, however humble, escapes being asked to take some part in it. Those who take an optimist view of things in general appeal to it as a most encouraging symptom. I have read addresses in which dignified clergymen expressed their misgivings about the tendencies of the age—lamenting the failure of belief among the educated, and the decay of religious practice among the uneducated, and the divisions which agitate the religious world, and the grave immoralities which prevail everywhere;—and then concluded by consoling themselves with the reflection that there never was a period when more new churches were built, nor handsomer nor costlier ones, than now.

We learn what to think about these things, most pleasantly, if we turn from our own times and plunge into the midst of the events and ideas of three thousand years ago. We will go back to the origin of the temple at Jerusalem, of which we read in the text. (2 Sam. vii. 1—7.) We see there how the idea of that temple first arose in David's mind. He had then become a very great king, had conquered his most powerful enemies, restored peace to his nation, and felt himself firmly settled on his throne. He had built himself a house of cedar. The ideal of royal splendour in those days was to live in a house ceiled with cedar and painted with vermilion. Meanwhile the Ark of God lay behind the curtains of a tabernacle or tent. And if that tent resembled the one which had accompanied the Israelites on their wilderness marches, a very mean-looking object it must have been, with its weather-worn curtains, part of woven goatshair, and part of skins, by the side of David's splendid palace. The king was struck with the incongruity—as many rich men have been in our own day, by the sight of a shabby church alongside of their own palatial residence—and he exclaimed, as we have read, to Nathan his prophet, "See now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the Ark of God dwelleth within curtains." He never seems to have entertained the previous question, whether he himself had been right in building himself the house of cedar? though that was one upon which much might be said on both sides.

His thought was one that is sure to rise in a luxurious age. Where all is sumptuous and splendid, must not the worship of God be splendid and sumptuous too? Perhaps we shall find an opportunity in a little while of distinguishing what is true and what is false in this idea.

On this question he consulted Nathan the prophet. Prophets, as we may learn from the case now before us, had their moments of inspiration, in which the Word of God came to them, and also their ordinary moments, in which they thought and acted just like other men. Thus Nathan's first idea was what would occur to everybody, when a large gift is offered for a religious purpose—to encourage the donor to proceed. It was splendid munificence in King David, and an

admirable employment of his majesty's money. You can hardly take up a local newspaper without finding an exact counterpart of Nathan's first thought. Probably those who comment on this work of yours will compliment the principal givers in a precisely similar tone. He said, "Go, do all that is in thine heart; for the Lord is with thee."

Now this advice was quite disinterested, as it would not perhaps have been if it had come from Zadok the priest, instead of Nathan the prophet. For a prophet had no personal interest in the building or decoration of a temple. In the Jewish Church there were two ministries, each entirely distinct from and independent of the other: that of the Priest, and that of the Prophet. And the two balanced, and restrained, and corrected each other. The performance of ceremonies, with the control of the buildings dedicated to ceremonial purposes, was the function of the priest. The higher office of declaring the Word of God, and speaking in God's Name—in fact, the teaching of the people—was the duty of the prophet. While the temple was indeed the House of God, it was also the palace of the priests, the sons of Aaron; much as in our own day, and in Christian nations, the cathedral church of a diocese, and even the humbler one of a parish, is not only a House of God, but also an ornament and decoration to the clergy who minister there. The prophet's place was outside the temple, the ritual, and the organization; and he sought his inspiration, not from ceremony, but direct from God. Nevertheless, Nathan's first impartial thought was that the project was very good, and that his own duty was to encourage it. However, he returned home, and in the night the word of God came to him. And that word contains some very remarkable things. Jehovah had been content with the tent or tabernacle that had wandered through the wilderness, and had never said to any of the judges that had judged Israel, "Why build ye Me not a house of cedar?" Earthly magnificence has often been lavished on the externals of religion; but no such thing has ever been demanded by God Himself. It is possible that it may be good for man to see religion so decorated; it is imaginable that man may worship more spiritually when surrounded by shapes and sounds of artistic beauty (though whether it is so is very questionable indeed); but it is quite certain that the Creator of heaven and earth has never demanded any such offering. Then David's offer is declined, in Jehovah's name, without any reason being at the time given. He is reminded of his lowly origin, apparently to rebuke his ostentation; and he is assured that his family shall remain after him, and even for ever. And it is predicted that, in his son's days, the house that he has projected shall be built. Elsewhere, we find the missing reasons for this delay. He had shed much blood in his past battles, and so defiled his hands. Or, his many wars left him no sufficient leisure for the work. Both reasons are given, one by David himself, and one by Solomon; and both may have affected the decision. However, the design was laid aside for the twenty-five or twenty-seven years that King David had still to reign. And those years were devoted to the accumulation of money and materials for the work.

In the history of this temple we find at every step a practical lesson for church-builders, or restorers. It was three times built or re-built—by Solomon, by Zerubbabel, and by Herod—a wonderful variety of characters. The first builder was Solomon, a great and enlightened king, at the head of the science of his age, and an amateur of art; so eclectic in his tastes as to be ready to fetch objects of art and artists even from heathen Tyre, the seat of Baal worship, much as we ourselves fetch them from sacerdotal and idolatrous Rome; yet without losing at first any of those purely spiritual ideas which were the special inheritance of the Hebrew. "Will God indeed dwell on earth? behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee: how much less this house which I have builded?" So he said in his consecration prayer. And we might add words that his father had said before in reference to his own provision for the great work: "Who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? For all things come of Thee, and of Thine own have we given Thee." There are no higher or more spiritual thoughts than those.

The first temple was a monument of great splendour and prosperity, which, nevertheless, had not yet forgotten God, but paid its first homage to His glorious majesty. And yet it was also a monument and a warning of the nearness of splendour and luxury both to idolatry and to vice. As the great intellect began to decay, which had kept æsthetic tastes and sensual passions in control, the builder of the temple sank gradually away from his spirituality, and subsided both into sensual vice and into sensuous idolatries—two evils that are nearer together than we sometimes imagine.

Then it was rebuilt a second time by a feeble band of exiles returning from Babylon, the children of the captivity, 42,360 in all, the poor remnant of a nation once numbering many millions. This was a true effort, made in a day of small things, as its builders sadly expressed themselves, made in humility and self-sacrifice, to keep alive the worship of Jehovah, the one true God, and to maintain the national existence, by building a central hearth and home of worship. In this case, there was no room for pride. The house was so inferior in beauty to that of Solomon, that all who remembered the former one wept, instead of rejoicing, on the dedication day. Yet that house succeeded, where Solomon's had failed. Idolatry was never intruded into it, except by the violence of heathen conquerors.

Its worshippers maintained it as the one earthly home of Jehovah until Messiah's day.

Last came the restoration by King Herod, which was, by far, the most magnificent of all. In an age when crimes were very great, and vice prevalent in high life, and especially upon thrones, King Herod was marked out by public opinion as the greatest monster of iniquity in the world. He was known to be capable of ordering the massacre of infant children, and even of the Messiah Himself, if he could have laid hold of Him. There was a slight vestige of superstition in his character, though of religion there could be none. Such a man could have no higher motive than to decorate his capital and perpetuate his own name. Yet he was, for more than twenty years of his wicked life, engaged in temple-building. And he built for the worship of Augustus as splendidly as for that of Jehovah.

Might not a wonderful study be made of the various motives which have actuated temple-builders? And every one of these might find its parallel among the Church-builders of our own age. The greatest glory of that second temple, which Zerubbabel built, and which Herod restored, was that the Lord Himself visited it. He walked and taught in its courts, and as He left it for the last time, His disciples drew His attention to the massiveness and beauty of what was Herod's work rather than either Zerubbabel's or Solomon's. "Master," they said, "see what manner of stones and what buildings are here." But they were to Him nothing but stones that should shortly be cast down. Our Lord had the most intimate sympathy with nature, but I do not think that there is a single word or act of His which displays the slightest feeling for art. The zeal for God's house, which devoured His very heart, was not to decorate it, but to drive out of it all mercenary worldiness.

There are yet two scenes of sacred history which I should like to have introduced here. One, Stephen, within the precincts of this very temple, at his last trial, discoursing on "Temples made with hands." And the other, Paul, uttering his slighting words on "art and man's device," on the hill of Areopagus, in view of the Parthenon at Athens, and of all the masterpieces of Phidias, which decorated the home of that purest and most beautiful idolatry which the world has ever seen, the worship of Pallas Athene—of intellect personified, virgin and pure. These two scenes have much to say on the church-building enterprises of all ages; but to dwell on them would overload the subject, and crowd out the more practical part of it, to which I now proceed as my conclusion.

This last point is the teaching of the New Testament on temples and temple-building. There could be no material building operations by Christians in Gospel days. Persecuted and unsettled wanderers, it was impossible for them to form any such design. Nor does the New Testament give any advice or instruction on that subject, except in the way of distant analogy. Yet phrases, such as temples, buildings, houses, walls, foundations, pillars, are of frequent occurrence in reference to spiritual things. And it is to these that we must turn to find the appropriate spiritual lesson of the day. Let us take first a word which is a favourite one of Paul—"Edification." The word is a strictly Pauline word: and he invented, as I believe, its application to spiritual things. No Greek writer, before his time, ever employs it in his peculiar metaphorical sense, nor any after, except those who have learnt from him. It is used once by Luke, who was his disciple: and once by Peter, who shows in many ways that he was a diligent student of the works of his beloved brother Paul. The word has now become one of the cant expressions of religion, which people use without attaching to it any definite meaning. But to Paul the sense was very definite. Edification means simply house-building: and in that sense he used it. He loved to contemplate his work in that point of view, as house-building. He seemed to himself a master builder (1 Cor. iii. 10) Ἀρχιτέκτων — which people with no tinge of Greek may see to be the original of our word *architect*. He flattered himself that he was a wise or skilful architect. "As such," he says, "he had laid a foundation which was Christ, and on this foundation he and others were engaged in building. What was the building which he thus founded, the edifice which he thus attempted to edify? There were two, each of which was a temple of God—one a part, the other the whole. One was the single individual Christian. The other the community or Church which contains them all. Let us look at them separately.

To Paul the Christian's body was a temple—a temple of the Holy Ghost—not the body dead and inanimate, but instinct with a living soul. This must become a temple for God to inhabit, filled with the Holy Ghost, and decorated with all the spiritual graces. To edify or build it was to promote its conversion into such a temple. On Christ, the one foundation on which the soul can rest, he must build precious marbles, silver and gold, *i.e.*, true beliefs, pure thoughts, noble motives, heavenward aims, holy and charitable deeds, so as to edify or build up each human being as a pure body animated by a sanctified soul. All parts of the ministry of souls must, he said, be directed to this work of edifying or building. The preacher must speak to edification, *i.e.*, to building the soul (1 Cor. xiv. 3-5). Church worship or ceremonies (we may add church-building here, though not named, as the analogy is very close) must be arranged with a view to edification—building the soul. (1 Cor. xiv. 26.) Church discipline must be exercised with a view, not to destruction, but

to edification, to building the soul. (2 Cor. xiii. 10.) All engaged in Church work are to remember that it is not knowledge, but charity—but love which edifies or builds the soul. (1 Cor. viii. 1.) Thus did this wise architect teach how to rear temples of the Holy Ghost. While single souls were thus being edified, or built, each one would be like some little oratory within the walls of a vast cathedral, whose ample vault was being constructed to embrace them all. The body of Christ, which is the Church at large, was to be built or edified in the edifying or building of each single one. (Ephes. ii. 21-22.) The foundation of the whole, as of each one, was Christ; and the head or cap-stone was Christ also—He the top and the bottom, the beginning and the end, the All, of each single soul and of the whole Church. On this work of edification, or building, first of the individuals, and through the individuals of the whole, all those to whom God has given either gift or office in the Church must labour. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, are all invested with their spiritual graces and authorities, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying, or building, of the body of Christ. (Ephes. iv. 11-12.)

We said that Peter was one of Paul's aptest scholars. For, in no writing of Paul himself is the Pauline idea of the edification of the body of Christ more graphically embodied than here. (1 Peter ii. 4-5.) "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye, also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." The great Christian Temple, then, is the community of Christians; and each Christian by himself is a temple of God through the Spirit. Among such and within such temples God is pleased to dwell.

Builders of material temples must never forget that such are only temporary homes of the spiritual one. David himself was conscious of this for he introduced in this connection his often repeated and favourite thought, "we are strangers before thee and sojourners, as were all our fathers: our days on earth are as a shadow, and there is none abiding." (1 Chron. xxix. 15.) Each for himself, and at last all together, the living stones look to be removed into the house not made with hands eternal in the heavens. Many motives may combine to promote the erection of a material building—coarse ostentation as in a Herod—refined love of artistic beauty as in a Pericles—desire to atone for carnage and robbery as in a William the Conqueror—the desire of a rich man to palliate his splendour and luxury, elevated by deeper and more spiritual views, as in a David: humble, self-sacrificing efforts to maintain a faith on which the world looks coldly and which has to struggle for existence, as in the captives from Babylon. The work may be anything, from the most noble to the most mean. But the edifying a soul is always the noblest work there is: and, next after this, the edifying many souls together, so as to be one in feeling and in worship. And, as in material building, the work begins with preparing the individual stones, so does spiritual building with preparing individual souls. You cannot build a spiritual temple, except out of living stones. No pains are too great to lavish on the preparation of any one of these. For none has any part in the holy city, the heavenly Jerusalem, unless he is spiritually alive. And every material building, and amongst these this of yours, must be judged by the effect that it shall have on souls, in edifying or building them up in truth and holiness. The fire of the great day shall try all our works, of what sort they are. Ere that final account begins, let us ask ourselves, does our material work tend to holiness, and do our ornaments and decorations illustrate and symbolize truth or lies.

At that great day—to bring the matter to its ultimate conclusion—we shall see the end of all perfection. All the material buildings will have fallen, and their stones will have crumbled. Even the pyramids of Egypt will have been reduced to grains undistinguishable from the desert sand. All man's institutions and organisations will have been dissolved. All those powers which be, or which were, ordained of God to last their appointed time—Monarchy or Republic, Presbytery, Episcopacy, Papacy—each and all, however, much some of them may affect eternal duration, have had their beginning and will have their end. Time and circumstances made them, and will unmake them again. But the individual beings, of whom each of us is one—we hope, we believe—if Scripture be the word of God, we have a right to believe, that each of these shall endure for ever. And, of those who are edified and built on the one foundation, each shall become a pillar in the temple of our God, for ever immoveable; and all together shall compose the walls of the New Jerusalem, which is nothing but the aggregate of all such living souls. Let every successful material effort like this of yours, urge us all to be more diligent in the real work, which is that on souls—individual, immortal souls.

You have now the outward stones, or perhaps in this case it would be more correct to say, the outward timbers. You have your ceiled house, on which perhaps one may trace some faint tinge of vermilion. Now for the living stones! A building may be raised by contract. Taste and skill are always at the command of money. But souls, more precious than the gold which perishes, no wealth can buy. And how hard it is to effect any real good on them. Men labour on them long lifetimes; and sometimes doubt at last whether they have achieved any real success at all. Yet zeal, and love, and prayer are powers. And the

grace of God is a greater power than all. Let the renewed building be a weekly and daily call to those who minister and worship in it to labour more devotedly, more wisely, and more lovingly, in preparing the living stones. And may the Lord give to many of these a place at last in the walls of His New Jerusalem.

THE DIVINE ORBIT OF LIFE.

By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A.,
Head Master of Uppingham School.

Sermon Preached in the School Chapel.

"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."—St. John xiv. 6.

HOW many thousand years has the great sea of human trouble, and passion, and doubt, and fear, tossed to and fro with the cry of fierce winds upon it; how it still tosses; and as well go stand on the sea shore, and ask your way of gusts that come and go, or hurrying waves, as look for help from the blind voices round about. Now one cry out of the darkness, now another sounds, but evermore darkness; and silence following each cry, as the waves swallow it up, till in the bewilderment even Apostles begin to think that God has forgotten, that He sleeps, that the storm will swallow Him too, and them with Him. But He rises, and rebukes the winds and the waves; but He rises, He speaks, and all doubt is at an end, and immediately they are in safety at the haven where they would be. What a picture of human life from the beginning of the world to the end. Each generation, each man in his turn, takes part in it. There is wild tumult, confusion, drowning voices, short-lived boasts, confident cries, soon lost in eternal silence and that behind the veil which falterers, calm or fearful, talk of; there is ignorance, confident, or timorous, or guessing, in all shapes of ignorance, under many names, floating like wreckage on this shoreless grave, where death, nothing but death, death to those who lead and those who are led alike, death to their wisdom, death to their folly, spoken or written, comes equally to all of them at last; noise and silence in perpetual succession, the empty noise of speculation, the despairing silence of death. But Christ is not asleep, though some think it. For us, too, there is a voice: all can hear it who choose to hear, it never ceases, evermore in the breaks of the noise, for nearly two thousand years it can be heard stilling the storm in the troubled heart of him who hears indeed. "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life": a calm, great certainty; a Voice, like a star in the black night, above the darkness, and yet a guide in it. A Voice which once truly heard puts an end by degrees to all the tumult; most strong, most triumphant with the grave in sight; gathering strength, and a diviner calm with the martyr, on the brink of that before which all human voices are dumb, and the most boastful, boast as they may, have nothing more to say. And though the martyr's witness at death is public, and of world-wide note, not less certain, albeit less public, is the daily experience known to every minister of God, when at dying beds the departing spirit bears witness to the Voice; or when through the days and weeks of suffering, which can have but one end, the power of the Voice, the great, sure Presence of Him who sleepeth not, though men often deem Him sleeping, the Word divine, "I am the Way, the Truth, the Life," long known, long felt, long proved in sickness, and health, in calm, and in storm, makes a glorious certainty of trust within, of life, and the victory of life, just when all man knows, and all man can say stops short; and be it defiant, or be it fearful, is most assuredly powerless, and drowned in the overwhelming wave of death. "I am the Way." What witness has been borne to the authority of the Voice. And what authority it claims. "I am the Way." What authority it claims. Remember every human voice, true or false, only claim's a pilot's authority, only claims to show the direction, only claims to tell us how to steer. But when the Son of God speaks, He, the Creator, not only shows the way, but *is the Way;* He, the Creator, both tells us how to move, and we move in Him, whilst He upholds, and is in, all our movements. Language fails, subtle as language is, to express the great heavenly truth, but it does not fail in pointing out the great difference between the highest claim of man, the pilot claim, and the Word of the Son of God, that He is the Way, that the Way of Life is both man's right movement, and, at the same time, a life in Him; a life so entirely Himself that the right movement is nothing less than His divine life carrying man in His orbit; as a planet launched in space carries within itself the path it has to travel, the power of movement and the path in one; sweeping through unseen infinity by an inner energy, which both speeds it along the deep, and tells it where to go; tracing out through the great void that moving line of light, unfailing, swift, and noiseless, which is set on high to be for signs and for seasons, for days and years, an absolute perfection of measure and certainty. "I am the Way." It is no teacher speaking that we hear, it is God the Creator calling to His creature: there is none other. There is but one Voice, one only; no other voice from two thousand years ago is worth anything in matters of life and death save this only, and those voices which speak of Him. No teacher of that time who deals with life and death is anything but dead, and out of date now. This Voice only speaks with divine certainty, the Voice of Him to whom a thousand years is as one day; the Creator calling to His creatures, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." "Ye in Me, and I in you"; that is His word. Hear, then, His Voice. Since the

world began hath it been known that any voice but this has spoken such a word? No teacher ever thought to claim more than a power to guide. Never did it enter into the heart of man to take the place of the Creator King, and call himself "the Way." Calm, divine, eternal is this Word resting on earth for ever in its immortality. Happy are we to have heard it, happy are we who receive it not only as when first spoken, but with the great inheritance of every Christian death-hour since that day; the great inheritance of the great cloud of witnesses by which we are encompassed. Lo they come, the happy dead; lo they come, from the first martyr, who fell asleep amidst the bruising of the stones, to the last child, who died with the name of Jesus on his lips to-day. All bear witness. "I am the Way, the Truth, the Life." Whoso hath ears to hear, let him hear.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for Binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 27, 1881.

WE are enabled, in the sermons we printed last week, to compare the Clerical and Medical professions in their aims as well as in their methods of procedure. Both sermons are very eloquent, able, and deserving of attentive consideration. Canon Liddon very truly describes the ability of the physician to demonstrate the physical reasons of moral truth. We have often had occasion to enforce the converse, that obedience to the moral law is the only way to perfect physical health. Some of our readers seem to have misunderstood Canon Rawstorne's most able and truthful discourse, of which an able correspondent writes:—"It is long since I have seen anything finer and more outspoken." The Canon objects to the clergy arrogating to themselves supernatural *powers*, not to their ministering about spiritual or supernatural things, and "turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just."

PREACHING IN THE IRISH CHURCH.

It has been remarked by a writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* that there is greater freedom of opinion in a Church connected with the State than in a Church which has been separated from State control. This statement is receiving a confirmation in the case of the clergy of the Irish Church, and should make Anglican Liberationists hesitate in their frantic cries for liberty. It is of course most inconsistent in a congregation to pay their minister to study theology, and then "boycott" him if he ventures to tell them what he has ascertained. Yet this is the plan in vogue in Ireland. The result naturally is that any divinity students who have brains and independent natures go across to England, and thus the Irish Church loses certainly the larger number of the most brilliant Irishmen. Those who do remain, resolved to have each a mind of his own and sink with the plummet rather than swim with the lawn, miss good rectories, or perchance, as in the case of a distinguished contributor to the PULPIT, an important bishopric.

Bigotry varies in Ireland. In the northern parts it rages far more fiercely than in the southern. Indeed, in the south there is a fair collection of moderate Broad Church divines; but everywhere, even in the metropolis, High Churchism is detested, and not unfrequently its representatives are tabooed in society. The clergy themselves are blameworthy, for if instead of imitating the timid conduct of the Irish landlords, they banded together determined to be no longer "dumb driven cattle," the laity would cease from their terrorism, would listen respectfully to their opinions, and would not discontinue subscribing towards their stipends. And how transcendently beneficial would be the effect on the laity if they permitted their ministers to speak out fearlessly, and, like the noble Beræans, themselves tested all pulpit utterances by an appeal to the Scriptures.

Many among the clergy plead that they cannot speak out without giving a kind and degree of offence which would close the minds and hearts of most of those who listen to them against their influence, an influence which on the whole tells for good, and which therefore they are not at liberty to sacrifice. To such I would commend for meditation these words of the Rev. Samuel Cox, in the preface to his fine work, *Salvator Mundi*:—"But do they not a little forget how much, and what grave, offence they are giving to their more intelligent and inquiring hearers, those who really give the spiritual tone to their congregations, by their silence or their equivocation? Truth may be dangerous, both to him who utters it, and even to those who listen to it. But is it our function, as ministers of the Word, to avoid danger, or to proclaim the truth? and are we so very much wiser and better than our hearers that the truths which are good for us may be highly injurious to them? If any man hold, or is convinced that he holds, any truth, in God's name let him utter his truth or conviction, and leave the consequences with the God who gave it him, and who is quite able both to rule and to save the world without our help, and is not in the least likely to be helped by any man's infidelity to his convictions. The Church is not dying, nor likely to die, of too much truth; but it is sure to languish if its teachers, even for the most amiable reasons, suppress the truth that is in them."

One word more. The Irish clergy are now reaping the fruit of having rejected for their Archbishop that

sympathetic Liberal, the late Dean of Westminster, and the misfortune will be visited upon their children as far as the third and fourth generation.

AN IRISH CURATE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Your arguments do not convince me. I frankly acknowledge that woman is by nature, and natural conformation, chaste to a degree man cannot be. I acknowledge therefore that their sin is greater, and, by parity of reason, that they have greater power over the sin both in themselves and others. That they make a trade of prostitution is, however, an accident consequent on their being possessors of a tradeable article. I should not like to endow man with a *selling power*, seeing that he goes out of his way to *buy*, and when he goes out of his way *to buy* from lust, is so much worse than the woman who sells, in the first instance, from poverty, or other motives, as to restore the balance of guilt, and deserve equal punishment. If there was *any* penalty on impurity, if there was *any* check even on the male spreading the disease, if there was *any* stigma even on the man, then I would admit the argument of the *greater* culpability of the female, though the fact of *buying*, as set against the fact of *selling*, squares the account in that. But there can be no comparison between punishment and *no* punishment; no lesser and greater, between impurity and legal enactments. As long as this is the case, I can only look on the Government as providing healthy indulgence in sin for the wicked when they *inspect women*, and do not prevent the whore from plying her trade, or give her any choice of leaving it; but only provide that she is in proper trading condition.

E. T.

SIR,—In urging attention to higher views than lie within the scope of the Contagious Diseases Act, the opponents of the measure get upon less debatable ground. "The corruption that is in the world through lust" is a deep wound, and no one supposes that the Act will do more than put a stitch or two into it. The wound in the body politic can only be healed by a radical change of treatment. Until the doctrine that we are "a holy seed," and ought to be "a holy people to the Lord," is much more generally pressed home; until the sacredness of the body as a temple of the Holy Ghost is more explicitly urged; until the difficulty which is thrown in the way of the young by stimulating diet is better understood; and until education is conducted on the lines of the Baptismal Covenant, for God and only through Him for the world,—the object for which he has made us male and female is more likely to be thought of with levity than as the gravest of subjects, and sins of impurity will not be kept in check as they might be.

W. G. H.

SIR,—In the letter by "A Surgeon," given in your issue of August 20th, I see this sentence—"It is one thing to cure or prevent these diseases; it is quite another to provide facilities to vicious persons for safe indulgence." I think "A Surgeon" may be glad to learn that among the resolutions passed at the great international congress, held at Geneva in 1877, an agreement with which is necessary before anyone can become a member of the British, Continental, and General Federation for the Abolition of the State Regulation of Vice, is this—"The Section of Hygiene desires especially to see removed all obstacles which at present prevent venereal maladies from being as extensively treated as every other form of disease in the hospitals which are controlled by municipalities and other public bodies, as well as in those which are supported by private liberality." Also that the Municipal Council of Paris, which five years ago appointed a commission to investigate the matter, issued its report on 28th December last, and then came to the following decision—"The Municipal Council, considering that the institution of the police of morals is destructive of the principles of individual liberty, without succeeding in accomplishing the end it professes to aim at, either in the diminution of venereal diseases or in the prevention of offences against public order and decency, resolves—That from and after the 1st January, 1882, the police of morals shall be abolished, and that the following system be established instead, viz.:—*that free dispensaries be established for venereal patients*, and that in all that concerns public order and decency the ordinary police shall be employed, and that all offences against public order and decency shall be tried by the ordinary courts of law."

Whether the scheme advocated by the Paris Town Council be the wisest or not, it is surely idle in the face of that, and in the face of the resolution of the Geneva Congress, to argue as if repealers were opposed to the surgical or medical treatment of venereal disease. Another resolution of the Geneva Congress, moved by Dr. Bertani, a member of the Commission appointed by the Italian Government for enquiring into the matter, was as follows:—"The special meeting of the Congress to consider the question of hygiene, recognising that the sanitary regulation of prostitution and the medical examination of women which is involved in it, are inefficacious for the protection of the public health from venereal affections or for limiting the diffusion of these maladies, declares itself convinced on this point, and calls for the abolition of all those governmental measures relating to prostitution which, while they fail to secure their proposed object, grossly violate the common law in the person of women."

In support of this resolution let me quote from the report of the Hong Kong Commission:—"In most cases where men complain of infection the disease appears to have been contracted in those brothels licensed for foreigners only, and *subject to regular medical* examination." Again, from the report of Mr. A. C. C. de Renzy, surgeon and sanitary commissioner of the Punjaub—"The results of the measures that have been taken for the last four or five years for the prevention of venereal diseases in this country, afford us no ground for congratulation. In the last five years little short of five lacs of rupees have been spent on the prevention of venereal ailments, and after all there is nowhere any substantial sign of permanent improvement." Again, from the report of the Army Sanitary Commissioners of the Presidency of Madras in 1876:—"Judged of by another year's experience, and over the stations as a whole, the results have been, so far, unsatisfactory, as regards the health of the troops, and enquiry is requisite, with view of arriving at the cause of failure and rendering the Acts more efficient, *if found to be practicable.*"

To turn to known supporters of the system. M. Lecour, so long head of the Police of Morals in Paris, in one of his books, says :—"Prostitution in France has increased, and is constantly increasing, and it is at this moment more dangerous to the public health than it has ever been before." Whilst Mr. Acton says :—"I was informed that on the day after these inspections the houses are specially frequented by the public, in the belief that there is the less chance of contracting disease. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that under the French system many yield to indulgence whom the fear of the natural penalty would otherwise deter. In considering the advisability of introducing health inspectors among the civil population in England, this should not be lost sight of." There are, however, many other reasons why curing disease of this kind does not succeed in diminishing disease, as it would have been natural to expect. Without entering into these, however, I will simply say that I think I am correct in stating that in 1876 we had spent £500,000 in England, outraged women (at the end of 1877 there had been 354,164 outrages upon perfectly healthy women), violated the constitution, and taxed decent people for ten years to have in our army 351 more cases of constitutional sickness in proportion than when we started, and at the end of 1877 exactly 8·6 per 1,000 men as the average for the last seven years, that being the very figure given in 1866, when the system as it now stands was first introduced among us.

Sir Hardinge Gifford, late Solicitor-General, in a recent speech said, "I need hardly say that the law considers all persons innocent until proved guilty, and further, that the law invests the person of every one of the Queen's subjects with its protection against the merest touch." By the laws of 1866 and 1869 all women are placed outside the protection of these constitutional safeguards, by which the meanest man is still protected, and also with regard to the accusation most deadly to a woman deprived of trial by jury, an enormous protection to the innocent.

And I conclude in the grand old words of that true patriot, Burke :—"What sort of a protection is this of he general right, that is maintained by infringing he rights of particulars? What sort of justice is this, which is enforced by breaches of its own laws? These paradoxes I leave to be solved by the able heads of legislators and politicians. For my part, I say what a plain man would say on such an occasion, I can never believe that any institution agreeable to nature, and proper for mankind, could find it necessary or even expedient in any case whatever to do what the best and worthiest instincts of manhood warn us to avoid."

A. E. N. BEWICKE.

P.S.—It is noteworthy that at the late annual Conference of the Federation, held for the first time in London, five of the Paris Town Council attended, also the head of Police from the Hague, and the Registrar from Hongkong. The Mayor and Recorder of Berlin sent letters of full sympathy. The Lord Mayor of London received all those interested at the Mansion House. The City Recorder presided at the evening public meeting. These laws concern citizens, more especially as they treat of women only. I have never yet heard of a meeting of women in their favour. There are innumerable meetings of women continually being held to protest against laws which are as directly of advantage to those women leading a vicious life, as they are a hindrance and a danger to every woman intending by God's help to keep her body in subjection.

DOCTORS AS PROPHETS.

SIR,—In your report of Canon Liddon's fine sermon preached before the International Medical Congress at St. Paul's Cathedral, an earnest appeal is made by the preacher to the members of the medical profession not to withhold from a dying person the knowledge of his approaching end, lest the sick man should not have time to prepare himself to meet his Maker. I wish to ask a question, viz., whether too much importance is not generally attached to the last few moments, often the last few dregs, of life? I know indeed—and thanks be to God for His overflowing mercies—that while there is life there is hope; that even at the eleventh hour, and when life is fast ebbing, the soul may be capable of the supreme agony of a deferred repentance, of an entire reliance upon Christ, and of an intensely sincere desire to have the past pardoned. But this (as everyone must admit) is the result of a very rare miracle of grace, and should not form part of our ordinary teaching, or corresponding practice. The question, as I would put it, is this :—What is the value of a repentance which is wholly dependant upon, and (as it were) galvanised into existence by the information of an approaching dissolution? We shall be judged by the *whole course of our lives*, and not by the last few moments : *these* (in such a case) must be left to the overflowing mercies and the inscrutable judgment of God. I feel convinced that the stress which we lay upon sickness as a time of preparation, of repentance, and of the exhibition of God's mercy, has in practice an unwholesome effect upon our people; it leads them to leave religion to the last. The sick bed, and especially the death bed, is a *difficult* place to teach repentance—to impart a religion which has not been felt and acted on during life. Oh! the preciousness of the *present!*—the present of life, health, and strength. *This*, not sickness, is the time for preparation. This, and not the last few days of existence, is the momentous time, "the day of Salvation." I may add, that from what I have been told by friends and relations in the medical profession, the withholding of the information spoken of is regarded as the scientifically proper and prudent course. The present practice therefore of medical men is not inconsistent with their Christian calling, but rather subservient to the cause of true religion.

H. J. POOLE.

SERMON WRITING.

SIR,—I have reason for thinking that the following account from Harriet Martineau's Autobiography of her method of composition will be useful to beginners in sermon writing :—"The prevalent doctrine about revision and copying, and especially Miss Edgeworth's account of her method of writing—scribbling first, then submitting her manuscript to her father, and copying and altering many times over till (if I remember right) no one paragraph of her 'Leonora' stood at last as it did at first—made me suppose copying and alteration to be indispensable. But I immediately found that there was no use in copying if I did not alter; and that, if ever I did alter, I had to change back again; and I, once for all, committed myself to

a single copy. I believe the only writings I ever copied were 'Devotional Exercises,' and my first tale —a trumpery story called 'Christmas Day.' It seemed clear to me that distinctness and precision must be lost if alterations were made in a different state of mind from that which suggested the first utterance ; and I was delighted when, long afterwards, I met with Cobbett's advice :—*to know first what you want to say, and then say it in the first words that occur to you.* The excellence of Cobbett's style, and the manifest falling off of Miss Edgeworth's after her father's death (so frankly avowed by herself), were strong confirmations of my own experience. I have always made sure of what I meant to say, and then written it down without care or anxiety—glancing at it again only to see if any words were omitted or repeated, and not altering a single phrase in a whole work. I mention this because I think I perceive that great mischief arises from the notion that botching in the second place will compensate for carelessness in the first. I think I perceive that confusion of thought, and cloudiness or affectation in style, are produced or aggravated by faulty prepossessions in regard to the method of writing for the press. The mere saving of time and labour in my own case may be regarded as no inconsiderable addition to my term of life. Some modifications of this doctrine there must of course be in accordance with the strength or weakness of the natural faculty of expression by language ; but I speak as strongly as I have just done because I have no reason to believe that the natural aptitude was particularly strong in myself. I believe that such facility as I have enjoyed has been mainly owing to my unconscious preparatory discipline ; and especially in the practice of translation from various languages. And, again, after seeing the manuscripts or proof-sheets of many of the chief authors of my own time, I am qualified to say that the most marked mannerists of their day are precisely those whose manuscripts show most erasures, and their proof-sheets most alterations."

August 22, 1881. J. R. S. C.

Reviews and Notices.

"Lectures in Defence of the Christian Faith." By Professor F. Godet. Translated by W. H. Lyttelton, M. A., Edinburgh : T. T. Clarke, 1881, pp. ix. 348.

This volume contains, in a well executed English version, six addresses delivered at Neuchâtel, in reply to a course of sceptical lectures which had just before been delivered in the same town ; and also a seventh address, on the "Immutability of the Gospel," in the form of a report presented to the Evangelical Alliance at Basle. This report is in substance a protest against the Socinianism of the modern party in the Foreign Reformed Churches, "who recognise in Jesus the predestined Saviour of the human race, the elect of God, the central man, raised up to lead mankind to the realization of their destiny, but who, notwithstanding all this, think of Him as no more than a mere man who had no existence any more than we had previously to His coming to earth." Professor Godet does not deny that in this party, which now comprises "a great number of very earnest thinkers and writers," there are to be found, in spite of their fatal heresy, "a sincere piety, an earnest love of Jesus Christ, an enthusiastic admiration for His person and His work ;" but at the same time he forcibly warns them that they are depriving Christianity of its definitive character, dethroning it from its permanent supremacy, and reducing it to "one of the days of humanity," one of the stages of the world's progress, to be followed sooner or later by another. "From the moment," he exclaims, "in which the Church should give her consent to this lowering of the person of her Head, would infallibly date the darkening of the revelation of God on earth, as well as the setting up again of the pride of man ; a marked enfeeblement of the dread called forth in the conscience of man by sin, and as it were a vaporisation of the sanctifying power of the Gospel ; and consequently a decline, in all respects, of the moral and religious influence of the Gospel upon society and the Church."

Turning back now to the Neuchâtel lectures which form the main body of the volume, we find them falling into pairs ; two being on our Lord's resurrection, two on miracles, and two on our Lord's Person. In character they are popular, and bear some marks of hasty composition ; but though here and there we miss a full grasp of the subject, and stumble on a questionable statement, we cannot doubt that on the whole they will prove interesting and useful. They are least satisfactory, we think, where they touch the domain of physical science. For instance, an explanation of the possibility of miracles is based on some rather curious views about nature and matter. "We detect in nature," we are told, "a constant tendency to emancipate herself from the law of physical necessity, and to lift herself by degrees into the sphere of liberty. . . . From mere matter up to men we observe in nature an ever-ascending tendency towards freedom. . . . Matter tends to spirit, because it is the creation of spirit. . . . Matter carefully studied appears by no means materialistic ; we find it everywhere impregnated with intelligence and freedom, those two essential attributes of spirit. . . . Such is nature. And upon this essentially spiritual and free character of its being rests the possibility in the abstract of miracles." Still more curious is the way in which the atomic theory is pressed into the vindication of the miraculous ; if we understand the following passage aright, it hints that the divine volition, although unable to act upon nature as a whole from the outside, yet penetrates through the interstices of the atoms, and by thus taking nature in detail and from within, compels it to obey. "Nature must be compared, not to a bag hermetically sealed on all sides, but to a net open in all its meshes, and penetrable in every part of its surface. These meshes are the mysterious atoms which constitute the essence of nature, and of which we cannot reasonably affirm the material, or immaterial, nature. Who can tell us that there is not here a door always open to the action of God?" Such is the way in which Professor Godet answers his own question, "By what means can the divine power act upon matter so as to impress upon it a modification which is not the result of its own laws?" an answer which he illustrates by the case of the organ-builder, who "in constructing it has reserved to himself access into the interior of the instrument, a means whereby the blast which is to breathe the breath of life into it can penetrate into all its parts." Thus he supposes God "to have created nature in such a manner as to have reserved to Himself a means of access through which He might act upon it and by it, with a view to the object which

He proposes to Himself, that is, the moral education of humanity."

If we find a difficulty in accepting this physical explanation of the miraculous, we heartily go along with Professor Godet when he points out the function of miracles, and their significance to the believer. "Miracles," he says, "as manifestations of the glory of Jesus, may develop faith in those who have the sense of that which is divine; they cannot create this sense in those who are without it. For this sense is of a moral nature; it is the hunger and thirst after holiness. Miracles have not the power to create this disposition of mind." So again: "The miracles are like the pedal to the playing of the divine musician." "The miracles are a course of preaching. They witness to the free and living God. They exhibit monotheism in action." The miracles of Jesus "are the visible symbols of the work which He came to accomplish. They tell us what Jesus is, and what He is ceaselesly doing, and represent to us in figure what He one day will do. They are samples of the final restoration and consummation." Once more; "as Jesus cleansed the lepers, cast out devils, raised the dead, by the finger of God; so is it ours to call down the new life into souls. Let us in this way become workers of miracles in ourselves and in our brethren, and we shall have no more difficulty in believing in those of Jesus Christ. A single prayer answered, a single case of living contact with the power of the Father, a single exertion of the power of Christ over the weakness that is in us, will teach us more upon the subject of miracles than all the arguments and explanations of the Apologist.

Such remarks as these are excellent; and we will add a few others, culled from different parts of the volume, as instances of the neat, epigrammatic style in which French writers excel. "The Primitive man could only have been a provisional man. The first Adam was but the rough sketch of the final man whom God planned." "God, duty, freedom, these three ideas form an inseparable trinity, revealed directly to the human consciousness, and of which each member stands or falls with the two others." "Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylon, which had swallowed up Israel, compels this monster to cast up on the sands of the sea-shore this prophet-nation, this new Jonah." "Cut out of the life of Jesus His miracles: then, to defend this first excision omit the discourses. To what then will you have reduced the Gospel-history? To a single line—'At this time it happened that nothing happened.' And we are to believe that out of this vacuum came forth the greatest event in the history of the world!" Our last extract will remind the reader of "Paradise Regained." "If we carefully weigh the expressions used in Scripture, we are led to believe that it was not till the hour of Christ's baptism that, by a divine communication then made to His Spirit, the consciousness of His Eternal origination, and of the personal relation in which He stood to God, was given Him. The divine declaration, 'Thou art My Son,' was not a superfluous assurance. It revealed Jesus to Himself, and became the foundation of the revelation which He made of Himself to the world."

The Bishop of Bath and Wells completed his 73rd year on Saturday last, having been born on Aug. 20, 1808. Lord A. C. Hervey is the fourth son of the first Marquis of Bristol.

ADDRESS TO SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS.

By the Rev. G. E. WATKINS.

Dear Friends,—Permit me to address to you, my fellow-labourers, a few words of encouragement and exhortation. As a steward to whom has been entrusted a share of work in the Lord's vineyard—a solemn charge, entailing a heavy responsibility—and one desirous of being found faithful to his trust, deeply conscious of the privileges attaching to it, I cannot allow so rare an opportunity to pass by without endeavouring to bring before you certain thoughts, embodying some moving principles, which in time past have influenced my own life, given a direction to my aims, and turned the current of my energies and aspirations into a spiritual channel.

Perhaps the thought and experience of fifteen years—an important span in a man's lifetime—spent in Sunday-school work may enable me to suggest some useful and practical hints, and to furnish you with subject matter for reflection.

So many and various are the subjects of engrossing interest, and so important are the considerations bearing on your work, that it becomes very difficult to fix on any particular point to bring specially before your notice. Yet there is one thought that is applicable to your work in all seasons; one prominent thought that occurs to me whenever I would enforce the duty of feeding the lambs of Christ's flock. It was St. Paul's motto, and should be the Christian's—his "Text for the year":—"The love of Christ constraineth me."

There are times when we feel more disposed than at other seasons to examine into our relationship towards those around us, to look into our inner selves, to inquire how far we have endeavoured, and to what extent we have succeeded in discharging the positive and relative duties imposed on us by the post we occupy, the station of life to which God has called us. Have any of us endeavoured to shun our responsibilities, to ignore those claims which God, by placing us where we are, has made upon us; turning a deaf ear to those calls, and neglecting those opportunities which, by God's grace and His providence, we had it in our power to respond to and turn to good account, had we felt so disposed?

No duty attaches to us for which we are not qualified *(i.e.*, incompetent through *no fault of our own)*; no moral obligation, *e.g.*, to become Sunday-school Teachers, unless our time, our talents, and our opportunities all point to that occupation as a duty. Yet doubtless many in the present day who hold back from the work might become qualified for it, competent to teach a class of children the elements of religious truth, did the love of Christ constrain them to make the attempt. This motive-power is indeed in itself one of the chief qualifications for the undertaking. Therefore the first and most fitting consideration for every volunteer for Sunday-school work is this: Does this principle animate me? Whatever may be the ultimate result of an inquiry into our qualifications as Sunday-school Teachers, its tendency at the outset is to quicken our own spiritual life, and so to be productive of immediate good to ourselves. More than that, the inquiry will induce in us a desire to possess those qualifications of which our self-examination has shown us to stand in need.

My object, therefore, in giving you a word of counsel is to suggest a few heads for self-examination. Let each one ask: What led me to engage in the work?

Was it a sense of the love of Christ to my own soul? Was it a sense of the vast importance of the work? Was it from a desire to turn to the best account that precious talent, time, which has been entrusted to me? Was I at first—or do I feel that I am now—duly impressed with an adequate sense of the inestimable privilege attaching to the effort I am endeavouring to make, to bring home to the souls of these little ones—His own by the covenant of baptism—some knowledge of that Saviour who has done so much for me? And have I given Him the first place in my own heart? These are a few of the interrogatories which at such a time as this we should do well to ask ourselves. Let us endeavour to bring them home to our own hearts. The inquiry cannot be too searching, it cannot be too vigorously thrust home. If we compel ourselves to answer these inquiries conscientiously, we shall engage in the great work with fresh zeal, under a more vivid sense of the responsibility which it involves.

The inquiry is a most fruitful one—one that must be productive of good. Let, then, each individual teacher endeavour to ascertain what the motives were which led him to enter upon the privileged calling of a teacher of Divine truth. Let him endeavour to analyse the reasons which prompted him to volunteer for work in the Lord's vineyard—the noblest sphere of usefulness open to the earnest Christian layman.

If any of us should be at a loss at first what to reply, let him ask himself this further question: Can I conceal the inner springs of my actions from Him to Whom I look for my reward? If I wished to hide from my fellow-men the motives which first influenced me, can I hope to keep them from the searching eye of Him Whom I profess to serve? They may be hidden from my fellow mortal's gaze, but *all* hearts are open to His all-seeing eye. It is *His* work in which I am engaged, and from Him nothing is hidden or secret, nothing concealed which shall not be made known. For with Him not only actions, but feelings and thoughts are weighed.

This consideration is of the utmost importance. It bears on a question relating to, but not wholly dependent on, a man's qualifications for the work. It is the expectation of a blessing upon our labours—the seal of our ministry—God's sign manual; a token that He has been pleased to accept our service, and grant it a measure of success. For He who seeth in secret regards our principles of action rather than the result of our work; we are responsible to Him for the former, He relieves us from any responsibility as to the latter. (1 Cor. iii. 6.)

For this reason, then, viz., because they will be rewarded rather according to the purity of their motives, than according to the measure of their success, it will not be an useless occupation for Sunday-school Teachers to inquire into the reasons which led them first to engage in the work originally; and then to proceed a step further, and to ask the causes and motives of their continuance in the undertaking. And no more appropriate word of counsel for the New Year can be given than the advice that is contained in the lines:—

> The Past review, the Present seize,
> No good comes from delay;
> Shun not, for sake of present ease,
> The duties of to-day!
> Let others seek themselves to please,
> Tread thou the narrow way;
> No Future may, in God's decrees,
> On earth before thee lay.

No other motive can be accepted by our Master as worthy of so good a work than the wish to please Him. The work of which He will approve is that which is wrought for Him. (Matt. xxv. 40 and 45.)

Let us try our Sunday-school work by this test:—Why do we teach? Is it because the love of Christ constraineth us? What said our Lord to Peter? "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Feed My lambs." Are we concerned for the safety of Christ's lost and wandering sheep? Do we wish to gather them into the fold of the Good Shepherd? Do we feel that Christ alone can save us and them? Do we desire to lead the young to Him as to their Saviour and ours? More depends on our object in the work than we perhaps conceive. Men will commend us according to our success; the Master looks more at the heart of the worker—more to the desire than the result. He will approve the effort quite as much, however feeble, if it be made from love to Him. The motive that will stand the test of His all-piercing eye is that of love for souls, springing from love to Him for what He has done for our own. Sunday-school Teachers must apply this test honestly to themselves, if they would know whether God's blessing is resting on their labours, and that their service is accepted. Yet even the foremost ranks—*i.e.*, the most faithful and devoted of Sunday-school Teachers—might be somewhat thinned, were this test—could this test—be annually applied, as a condition of their acceptance: were this qualification demanded of all desirous of engaging in the work.

Nevertheless, any less worthy motive is out of place in a work of such importance as Sunday-School teaching. It is work for Christ, not for ourselves. It should therefore be undertaken out of love to Him, and love for the souls of the children we seek to lead to Him.

This love is His gift, and may be had for the asking. It is the only motive of which He can approve, the only one which He can accept and reward. It should underlie all our work for Him, especially that which has for its direct aim the extension of His Kingdom—that invisible Kingdom of Heaven—in the souls of those around us.

II. This principle will lead you to cultivate—as another qualification for the work—a spirit of self-sacrifice. The want of this spirit leads us to avoid the duty which is plain but not pleasant.

It leads to excusing ourselves on the ground of other calls and other duties. (Luke xiv. 18-20). It leads to the omission of duties likely to be attended with benefit to our scholars, for fear of the self-denial involved, the labour to be incurred. Thus it hinders the success of our work, and mars our hope of usefulness as Sunday School teachers. But the fact that you whom I am addressing have overcome the first difficulty, and have given yourselves to the work, shows that you are imbued with some portion of that grace of charity—one of the first fruits of the Spirit—without which all our doings are nothing worth.

(To be continued.)

The Right Rev. Alfred Ollivant, D.D., Bishop of Llandaff, was born at Manchester on August 16, 1798, and thus completed his eighty-third year on Tuesday (16th inst.). His lordship was consecrated Bishop of Llandaff in 1849, and in point of age is the oldest prelate on the Episcopal Bench.

At the annual meeting of the Lord Bishop, the Archdeacons and Rural Deans of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, and at the commencement of the proceedings of their conference, the Archdeacons presented to his lordship the following address, signed by them on behalf and at the request of 570 clergy of the two archdeaconries :—

"*To the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.*

"We, the undersigned clergy of the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, cannot allow the conclusion of your lordship's labours during the eleven years in which you have been engaged as chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament, to pass unrecognised by us.

"We feel that your lordship's persevering labours reflect distinction upon the diocese, and we trust and pray that your lordship may long be spared to the Church, and that the results of your Episcopate may be largely felt in a fuller understanding of the Holy Scriptures and a wide-spread among us of true religion."

The Bishop has returned the following reply :—

"Newport, Berkeley, August 16, 1881.

"My dear Archdeacon and Brethren,—The sad loss we have all sustained in the sudden removal from us of our dear and valued friend, the Archdeacon of Bristol, has prevented my writing to you till the present time, but acknowledge with heartfelt thanks the particularly kind and gratifying address.

"It is true, as you remind me, that eleven years have passed since I have had the responsibility of holding the post of chairman of the New Testament Company, and it is not without the expression of deepest thankfulness to Almighty God that I call to mind that He mercifully permitted me to be present at nearly every meeting, and so to have become very closely connected with a great and responsible work. Your most friendly recognition of this is a very full reward for long labours, and makes the retrospect all the happier.

"Sincerely do I join with you in the prayer that a fuller understanding of God's Holy Word may, through this revision, be vouchsafed to all who use our mother tongue, and that thus true religion may be more widely spread both in our own country and all the distant lands in which that tongue is spoken by our fellow-men.

"Again begging to convey to you my heartfelt thanks, I remain, my dear brethren, most sincerely yours,

"C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baring-Gould, Rev. Sabine, rector of East Mersea; rector of Lew Trenchard.

Bedford, Rev. Joseph Louis, curate of Longton, Stoke-on-Trent; perpetual curate of St. John's Hospital or Little St. John Without the Northgate, Chester.

Bowker, Rev. H. Charles, incumbent of Christ Church, Sculcoates, Hull; rector of Culmington.

Cholmeley, Rev. James, rector of Swaby, Alford, Lincoln; curate of Holbeck.

Cooke, Rev. Frederic, perpetual curate of Preen church.

De Winton, Ven. Henry, archdeacon of Brecon, rector of Boughwood, Radnorshire; rector of Cefnllys with Llandrindod.

Grenside, Rev. Frederick Ralph, curate of Thornhill; vicar of Mirfield.

Hocking, Rev. John Hocking, curate-in-charge of Littlehamholt; rector of Copdock with Washbrook, Suffolk.

Horan, Rev. J., assistant minor canon in Chichester Cathedral; vicar of Bapchild, Sittingbourne.

Hughes, Rev. Richard, rector of Southam, Rugby; vicar of St. Matthew, Southampton.

Hussey, Rev. Edward, curate of Earl's Heaton, Leeds; rector of Ringstead St. Andrew, Norfolk.

Jackson, Rev. Corrie, curate of North Malvern; rector of Hilgay, Norfolk.

Joncs, Rev. David, vicar of Dyserth; vicar of Llanrhaiadr yn Mochnant.

Jones, Rev. Hugh, curate of Selattyn; rector of Melverley.

Jones, Rev. John Arthur, vicar of Cundall with Norton-le-Clay.

Karney, Rev. Reginald J., rector of Swalecliffe and chaplain to the Earl of Kintore; British chaplain at Christ Church, Hyères, France.

Kirby, Rev. Augustus George, curate of Newnham with Mapledurwell, Winchfield, Hants; rector of Pebmarsh.

Leachman, Rev. Edmund, curate of Frating, Colchester; vicar of Chrishall.

Lukin, Rev. William Hugo, rector of Wickford, Chelmsford; rector of Downham.

Macmurdo, Rev. Frederick Thomson, curate of Littleport, Ely; rector of Coltishall and Great Hautbois, Norfolk.

Meynell, Rev. Henry, curate of Denstone; perpetual curate of Denstone.

Mills, Rev. William, curate of Upton-cum-Chalvey, Slough; rector of Bennington.

Moore, Rev. James Henry, rector of Whatley; perpetual curate of Kenwyn St. John.

Norris, Rev. John Pilkington, vicar of St. Mary Redcliffe, canon of Bristol; Archdeacon of Bristol.

Northcote, Rev. Arthur Francis, minister of Spottiswoode's Chapel, New-street-square; rector of Dodbrooke.

Phillips, Rev. Samuel Frederick, vicar of Wonastow, Monmouth.

Phillips, Rev. Samuel Henry, curate-in-charge of Hannay and Maltby, Alford, Lincolnshire; vicar of Old Newton, Norfolk.

Pierson, Rev. William Frederic, vicar of Settle; rural dean of the Northern Division of Craven.

Pratt, Rev. Dashwood, curate of Tasburgh, Long Stratton, Norfolk; vicar of Barney, Norfolk.

Radcliffe, Rev. C. B., curate-in-charge of Christ Church, Weymouth; rector of Woodbridge, Suffolk.

Read, Rev. Edward, vicar of Milbrook; perpetual curate of St. Paul, Devonport.

Rogerson, Rev. G., rector of Elton; perpetual curate of Peak Forest.

Sanders, Rev. W. S., vicar of Holy Trinity, Gosport; vicar of St. Luke's, Southampton.

Shuffrey, Rev. William Arthur, curate of Tarporley; perpetual curate of Halton Gill.

Thackeray, Rev. Arthur Thomas James, curate of Euston and Barnhams, Thetford, Suffolk; rector of Blofield, Norfolk.

Thomas, Rev. David Lloyd, curate of Wensley-with-Leyburn, Bedale; vicar of Aslacton.

Trotman, Rev. Edward Fiennes, priest-vicar-in-charge of Wimborne Minster: vicar of Marshfield.

Watson, Rev. George, rector of Great Sutton, Rochford, Essex; rector of Theberton, Suffolk.

Weight, Rev. Thomas Joseph, curate of Newnham, Gloucestershire; vicar of Newnham.

Williams, Rev. E. O., curate of Ilkley; vicar of St. Stephen's, Burmantofts, Leeds.

Whitmarsh, Rev. Robert Thomas, rector of Carlton-with-Ashby, Norwich; vicar of Thurton, Norfolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Anstey, Rev. Charles Alleyne, M.A., of Trinity College, Oxford, late vicar of Coggs, and for many years assistant-master of Rugby School, at Clifton, Bristol, on the 19th inst., aged 84.

Bland, Rev. Miles, M.A., at Elm House, Gateacre, Liverpool on the 17th inst., aged 53.

Bridger, Rev. John, at 13, Lansdown-place, Clifton, on the 13th inst.

Dixon, Rev. John James, for thirty-six years vicar of Abram, near Wigan, and J.P. for county of Lancaster, at Bredon House, Malvern, on the 17th inst., aged 72.

Hamilton, Rev. Joseph Harriman, M.A., canon of Rochester Cathedral, at the Precincts, Rochester, on the 17th inst., aged 81.

Meredith, Rev. Canon, late vicar of Abergele, at Rhyl, on the 6th inst,, aged 82.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE MAN OF SIN.

By the Rev. R. C. W. Raban, M.A., formerly Senior Chaplain H.M.'s Madras Establishment, and late Scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

"That Man of Sin."—2 Thess. ii. 3.

In this chapter we have a very remarkable prophecy of the time intervening between St. Paul's days and the Lord's second Advent. The most diverse interpretations have been assigned to it in different ages of the Church's History.

From the very first it engaged attention. The general opinion among the early Christians was in favour of the Roman Empire being the restraining power (spoken of as already in existence in the Apostle's time), and that on its overthrow the dissolution of the present economy would bring about the glorious Epiphany of Christ. Natural as this view would be to earnest and devout minds living under the oppressions of Pagan Rome, subsequent history has shown its incorrectness: The Lord has not yet come, and we whose lot is cast in these days of the nineteenth century are still looking for the signs of that Advent as the early Christians were in the first three centuries of our Era.

The prosperity of the Church under Constantine was followed by ages of ignorance and superstition, and it is not surprising that as love grew dull and faint the truth of the Saviour's second Advent lost its hold upon the Church. The idea of the Papal Power being here predicted, under the figure of "the Man of Sin," grew up in the West about the eleventh century; and as that Power showed itself more and more cruel and oppressive to the rising spiritual life of the Church, this view naturally gathered strength, so that in the sixteenth century the Reformers generally adopted it, or modified it by the theory of a double Antichrist, as in the Eastern Church Mohammed had long been regarded as "the Man of Sin" in this passage; while the controversies of the sixteenth century suggested to Estius and others in the Church of Rome the idea that Luther and the Protestant Churches were the development of evil. In our own century both the first and third Napoleons have been taken to fulfil the Prophecy, and numerous other opinions have been held by different writers.

The chief difficulties in the way of the Papacy being here marked out by St. Paul are these:—

1. The natural connection places the appearance of the Man of Sin immediately before Christ's manifestation, and yet hundreds of years have elapsed since the mystery of iniquity (*Gk.*, lawlessness) has been developed if the Papacy be the Man of Sin.

2. The Pope is the devoted servant of the false gods he creates, and cannot be called their antagonist and opponent as the fourth verse declares the Man of Sin* will be.

3. St. John says of Antichrist that "he denieth the Father and the Son," words which seem distinctly to point to an Infidel Power.

4. Further assuming (as we may do, the interpretation being so generally allowed) that the Papacy is described in Rev. xvi. xvii. under the figure of the woman bearing the names of Mystery and Babylon, seated upon the ten-horned Beast, its destruction is clearly foretold (Rev. xvii. 16) as brought about by human agency; whereas St. Paul tells us, "the Lord will consume" the Man of Sin "with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming" (*Gr.*, completely destroy with the manifestation of His presence).

Great names are to be quoted for this interpretation (notably Bishop Wordsworth in our own day), but these difficulties seem to us still to wait their solution and lead us to look forward to a still future development of evil in a personal Antichrist.

But here we are met by a difficulty. Was the Early Church wrong in taking the restraining power to be the Roman Empire (ver. 6), and does not St. Paul appeal to the Thessalonians as knowing from his own lips what that restraining power was—and, if so, are we not bound to accept the testimony of the earliest Christian writers on this point? and granting this, are we not further taught to expect the appearance of the Man of Sin upon the dissolution of that Empire? No doubt, if we could be satisfied that this interpretation of the restraining power was authoritative, and really derived from St. Paul, we should be bound by it; but so early as the fourth century we have the express testimony of the great Augustine against this view, for he says plainly that he was ignorant what the restraining power was, and it seems impossible that he should thus speak of it if by general consent an authoritative interpretation were in his day attached to it.

Some take "the restraining power" in a more general sense, and understand by it the moral and conservative influence of political States. Others (and this view is in exact agreement with the vision of Daniel—chap. ii.—and may explain the early opinion of Church writers in favour of the then existing empire) extend the idea of the old

* Some explain this verse of a *false* Christ usurping the functions of the true Christ, and not of an *opponent*. The Greek preposition *ἀντί* is no doubt used in both senses, but Chrysostom's interpretation seems decisive in giving it the adversative sense.

Roman Empire to the ten kingdoms which succeed it. Either of these views corresponds with history, of which we must necessarily be better judges than those who lived close to the Apostolic times.

Stress has been laid on the improbability of the Early Fathers holding such a view except on the authority of the Apostles; but believing as they did in a *Personal* Antichrist it was natural for them to connect the final development of evil with the downfall of the Empire and we have Tertullian's express testimony that they did connect them.

Having shown that the withholding power in this passage admits of an explanation in harmony with the idea of a yet future Man of Sin, in whom all the details of the prophecy will be completely fulfilled, we may proceed to supply the characteristic features of the future Antichrist as furnished to us by two of the earliest Church writers—Irenæus and Hippolytus. Their testimony is specially interesting, as the former was himself a disciple of St. John, and Hippolytus, a pupil of Irenæus, would naturally reproduce his master's opinions:—"Antichrist," says Hippolytus, "shall be shameless, a war-maker, and a despot, who, exalting himself above all kings and above every god, shall build the city of Jerusalem and restore the Sanctuary. Him the impious will worship as God and will bend the knee to him, thinking him to be the Christ. He shall cut off the two witnesses and forerunners of Christ, Enoch and Elias." From this passage it is evident that Hippolytus connected Dan. xi. 36, &c., and Rev. xi. with this prophecy.

On Dan. xi. 41:—"He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon"—he says—"Edom, Moab, and Ammon are they who ally themselves with him on account of their kinship, and first address him as king: he shall be proclaimed king by them, and shall be magnified by all, and shall prove himself an abomination of desolation to the world, and shall reign for a thousand two hundred and ninety days."

He therefore understood the duration of Antichrist's reign to consist of *literal* days—as he elsewhere speaks of it as three years and a-half (apparently in allusion to Rev. xi. 2). The great work of Irenæus is very imperfect, but we possess his comment upon this very passage, in which he most clearly identifies the Man of Sin with the future Antichrist, and defines the duration of his power to three and a-half years. "He shall reign for three years and six months, and shall sit in the temple at Jerusalem—then the Lord shall come in the clouds from Heaven in the glory of the Father, sending him and those who obey him into the lake of fire; but bringing to the righteous the times of their kingdom" (an evident allusion to Dan. vii. 18: "The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever").

It appears that both Irenæus and his pupil Hippolytus believed that Antichrist would be of the tribe of Dan; although it is uncertain whether they derived it from the old Jewish* tradition preserved in the Targums, or from the omission of the tribe in the seventh chapter of Revelation, coupled with the fact of the Danites being the first to fall into idolatry, as recorded in the Book of Judges. We find also that both these Fathers regarded the little horn of Dan. vii. as the same as "the Man of Sin" in this passage; and from them this view seems to have been generally adopted in the Early Church.

In ascribing the descent of Antichrist to the tribe of Dan, we have probably merely the individual opinions of Irenæus and Hippolytus; but the broad line of interpretation may be very probably that of St. John himself. Thus with regard to the Personality of Antichrist, his character as an opponent of Christ, rather than a false Christ usurping the functions of the true Messiah, and the connection of the prophecy of "the Man of Sin" with Daniel's predictions of the little horn and the wilful king, we have apparently a tradition of the highest authority. So also with the identity of the various periods used to mark the duration of Antichrist's reign—viz., times, time, and dividing of time—forty-two months, or twelve hundred and ninety days.

We have not time within our present limits to enter into the very difficult question whether these days and months are literal or symbolical. All we can do now is to direct attention to the earliest view of Antichrist which has come down to us as connected with this passage; and we are the more anxious to do this, as there seems no little danger in the present day of overlooking altogether or else misinterpreting the views of the Early Church. The study of Prophecy has a special blessing attached to it in the Inspired Word, and the general interest taken in it is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. May that blessing be ours, my brethren; may we have understanding to know the times, so that the signs of the Lord's Advent may not pass by us unregarded, and that we may be kept from the evil, and be presented faultless before Him at His Coming with exceeding joy.

---

* The Jerusalem Targum on Gen. xlix. 18 paraphrases thus: "Not for the deliverance of Gideon the son of Joash does my soul wait, for that is temporary; not for the redemption of Samson, for that is transitory; but for the redemption of the Messiah, the Son of David, which Thou through Thy Word hast promised to bring to Thy people, the children of Israel: for this Thy Redemption my soul waits"—to which the Targum of Jonathan adds: "For Thy Redemption, O Jehovah, is an everlasting Redemption."

THE THRESHING-FLOOR OF ORNAN—THE FUTURE TEMPLE.

By the Rev. T. ARCHIBALD S. WHITE, M.A., English Chaplain at Baden-Baden.

Sermon Preached at All Saints', Baden-Baden, on Sunday Morning, July 31st, 1881.

"Then the angel of the Lord commanded Gad to say to David, that David should go up, and set up an altar unto the Lord in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite."—1 Chron. xxi. 18.

DURING forty years—the latter portion of the eventful life of David—from the time that he became King of Judah at Hebron, a prominent character is Joab. Though apparently older than David, Joab was the King's nephew, being a son of David's own sister, Zeruiah. He was a capable man, a valiant general, and a loyal subject; but, like most of the warriors of that time, implacable and deadly in his revenge, unswerving and unscrupulous in the attainment of any objects he had set before himself. At the time when he appears before us to-day, he had been guilty of three cold-blooded—what we should call cowardly—murders. Yet still he is David's adviser, and commander-in-chief of his armies. David knew his guilt, and so did all Israel and Judah. But still, there he was, generalissimo. Such was the rudeness of the times. Society—civilisation—was in a state of embryo. Abner he had treacherously slain in revenge for his own younger brother, Asahel—the swift-footed—the darling of the family circle. Absalom he had thrust through the heart as he hung helpless in the oak. Amasa he had stabbed at a friendly meeting, apparently through jealousy at his being appointed captain of the host in his place after Absalom's death.

Yet still, Joab, after these three black crimes, is allowed to remain David's adviser—his military representative in the field. Doubtless one reason for this was his ability and daring and experience—his renown as a warrior, and the magic of his name among the troops. But it is believed that his knowledge of David's guilty secret in the matter of the murder of Uriah the Hittite was a more powerful motive for the retention of the unscrupulous Joab in the chief military command. David's reign is drawing to a close. In the vanity of his spirit he decides upon taking a census of his people without first taking counsel of the Lord, or asking his prophets Nathan and Gad. Joab at once sets his face against the proposal, and in this bold step is backed by the unanimous voice of his subordinate officers. But the King's word was law, and in spite of their remonstrances they felt there was no course left open to them but to obey. A census was in itself in those days a laborious and troublesome thing. It took up much time, in this case nearly a full year of incessant travelling and work. They began at the East, then worked round to the North and West, and finished at the South. The officers visited the towns and cities, took up their quarters in them for the time being, and then summoned the villagers of the surrounding districts to report themselves there. Thus it was a labour also for the populations. But it was not the labour probably which they disliked—there was some objection in the mind of Joab and his captains which is not quite apparent upon the sacred page. It may have been, probably was, a religious objection. But the King's wish prevailed against that of Joab and his fellow-officers, and they reluctantly set about their task. May it not have been that as religious men, which we may well believe they were, they did not like to undertake any such important enterprise without being clearly assured in the appointed way through the Church that it was in accordance with God's will?

In the actual numbering of the people there was no harm. The motive with which it was done, and the feelings from which it arose—there was the sin.

A first perusal of this narrative, and especially David's words—"These sheep, what have they done?"—might lead to the conclusion that the people were innocent. But if we turn back to the parallel account in the Second Book of Samuel, we shall see that it all came about because Israel had sinned. The Lord was angry with them, and Satan moved David to number the people. That the mere numbering of the people was not wrong or sinful in itself is shown by the fact that Moses had done the same by God's command. But in David's case God gave no command, and he did not ask counsel of the Lord before he began the work. It all arose in his case from pure vanity and pride. And he may well have been proud; for the results of a defective census gave over a million and a half of warriors. An enormous array, and one with which he might have eclipsed the conquests of Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, or Napoleon Bonaparte. But it is God alone who can give the power to make conquests, and if David had any such ambitious designs, those objects were at once frustrated. He was checked at once, and taught in the most forcible manner, at all times and in all things, to submit himself to the will of God. He was asked to choose his punishment—"Either three years famine; or three months to be destroyed before thy foes . . . ; or else three days the sword of the Lord, even the pestilence in the land."

He chose the last; with a repentant and contrite heart he yielded himself to the long-suffering, and the mercy, and the correction of the Almighty.

There is something pathetic in this threefold choice. Of the two former David had already made trial. For three years there had at one time of his reign been famine. For three months he had fled before Absalom—his own son—become his enemy. Now he is to have the third trial—

the shorter, perhaps sharper and more destructive trial. The former two might lightly be ascribed by many to the laws of nature—in the world at large, and in a man's own heart. This last shall be clearly from the Lord, and His destroying angel with the drawn sword shall be seen and feared.

It was a sharp trial indeed. It came towards the end of an old man's life. It is the last recorded event before David's final sickness. All the events of his wondrous, eventful life must have passed before his mental gaze as that destroying angel stood before him, and the people were dying in agony around him. All his sorrows and all his sins (this, the last—his vain numbering of the people). All his joys and successes. His humble, cheerful, ancestral home—his father, mother, sisters, brothers, relatives and friends. The Prophet Samuel, with his venerable mien and the horn of anointing oil. The unwieldy form of the giant Goliath—the handsome form of his best and bravest, noblest friend, Jonathan—the heir-apparent but for Divine interposition in his own favour. The scenes of his wanderings—the implacable enmity of Saul—the final triumph of his cause—the general prosperity of his reign. These—all these—and many more of which we know nothing, may have passed through the mind of David, as the phantom memories before the mind's eye of a drowning man, while he beheld before Ornan's threshing-floor the angel and the drawn sword above.

Can it not also be that, at *that* dread moment when he recognised his sin, he cast his thoughts back into the long centuries of mankind. Haply he saw in imagination the first parents of our race cast forth from Eden's beauteous glades, and barred henceforth with their posterity from its pure and blissful scenes. Sin had entered into their world as it had into his heart and kingdom. As cherubims with flaming swords barred *them* irrevocably out, so now in the way of *his* kingly majesty stands the Angel of Death between the earth and the heaven, and sees David with his company prostrate in the dust. Or perhaps he cast back his thoughts to a more recent scene, but yet one that still loomed out of the midst of the centuries that had fled. To a scene which had been enacted on that very hill of Moriah whereon he lay with his elders—all of them clothed in sackcloth. He thought—he *must* have thought—of that day when Abraham and his only, his beloved son Isaac had ascended that same hill of Jebus, and God's angel had called unto the devoted father out of heaven, "Lay not thine hand upon the lad . . . for now I know that thou fearest God." Or may he not—must he not—with prophetic soul have cast his thoughts forward to those wondrous and eventful one thousand years that were coming when the spot of Ornan's threshing-floor should be the base of that Altar round which a nation's prayers and hopes should circle, and from which the smoke of victims should ascend, which alone in the world should typify the One Great Atoning Sacrifice that should in the fulness of time be effected for the sins of the universe? Yet further on to HIM who should fulfil those types and realise in His own Person the promises which had little by little been revealed to the world, and now are spread abroad in their gracious fulfilment in the Gospel of our dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Verily, David stood on the vantage ground of the spiritual battle-field and showed in his own penitence and manifested forth in God's great forgiveness towards him the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the exceeding power of penitence, the exceeding mercy and lovingkindness of that great God, whom he had, whom we have so often and so grievously offended. No wonder that in the fulness of his grateful heart, the sweet Psalmist of Israel is forthwith heard to exclaim, "This is the House of the Lord God, and this is the Altar of the burnt offering for Israel." (1 Chron. xxii. 1.) No wonder that he at once began his preparations for the building of the Temple upon that hallowed site, a site hallowed in the minds of king and people by unlooked-for forgiveness of sin, a site that was henceforth in a peculiar sense to typify the forgiveness of sin, and not of the sin of one king, and one people only, but that of all generations of men that have before that time and since lived upon this earth, whereon we dwell.

Upon that Altar year by year the Paschal Lamb was to be outstretched, upon that Altar the blood to be sprinkled which should typify the eternal Blood which Jesus Christ Himself should shed so near that very spot.

Oh, what memories for us and for all mankind hallow the place and haunt the environs of that lowly threshing-floor where the Jebusite chieftain and his sons plied their lowly toil!

Every nation, when it begins to feel its unity and existence, centres it not only in its civil government but in its religious worship also. The secular and the sacred form together the point round which the national life plays. Differences of opinion within certain limits are healthy signs of life both with regard to the national Constitution or form of government and also with reference to the ceremonies and ritual of the Church. But if in either the balance preponderates too heavily on the one side or the other, the scales of the national life are overturned, the equipoise is lost and the fabric is involved in ruin.

The Israelites and the men of Judah in David's reign, were gradually consolidated into one people; under his genius blessed by God, they became reconciled to a form of government which was almost new to them; but there was still a want. And this want the Lord was about to supply. Jehovah in His own inscrutable ways made the occasion of the pestilence (the account of which we have read to-day) the foundation

stone of their national religious life. It cannot be said that they had hitherto been an irreligious people, but their religion was wanting in that outward expression which a national fane and ceremonial can give.

What Christian Cathedrals are to Christian nations, that the coming Temple of Jerusalem was to be to the Jews. Its foundation stone was, so to speak, laid that day when David purchased the threshing-floor of Ornan, or as he is called elsewhere Araunah the Jebusite. The Lord openly sanctioned that site when David, having erected an altar there, was answered by the Almighty with fire from heaven.

Where now was the Ark of God? It was in the citadel of Jerusalem, protected by a tent which the king had erected for it there. Within that Ark were the two tables of stone which God Himself had given to Moses. Where too was the Tabernacle which Moses had made? It was in a town a few miles north of Jerusalem—at Gibeon, and thither, hitherto, had David been wont to repair for his more special, formal public acts of worship. Within that tabernacle was the brazen altar which Bezaleel, the son of Uri had made. Thus the sacred relics of Mosaic ceremonial were scattered, imperfectly protected, and there was no Temple of the Most High to proclaim the self-sacrifice, devotion, and adoration of the people. This David was determined they should have if the Lord willed. And the Lord deigned to take pleasure in his wish, but not to permit its erection in David's own time, as in achieving the national unity much blood had been shed by him. All he was permitted to do was to select the site and to prepare for the building—the erection and completion were reserved for the more peaceful days of Solomon.

No one who reflects for a moment can conclude that David incurred all this expense, and took all this care without a sure hope of a Resurrection to a future life—without chiefly thinking of Him (of Whom he was the type) who should bring life and immortality to light. If we want sufficient evidence of this in the record of David's life, we certainly must be blind not to trace it in his wondrous Psalms. There the coming sufferings and eternal triumphs of the Messiah are pourtrayed in terms which seem to bring before us the scene of the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. Dimly, perhaps, he foresaw all the reality and the mystery, and the salvation, but though he "received not the promise," he "obtained a good report through faith, God having provided some better thing for us, that" he "without us should not be made perfect." By God's providence he was enabled to pave the way for that grand celebration of Divine worship which became the wonder of Palestine and the countries round—a worship the special object of which was to foretell the Gospel news. In that temple was enshrined, so to speak, the embryo of the Gospel—the mustard seed which should hereafter grow to be a great tree overshadowing the nations. What wondrous events then flow from that day when Ornan and his sons were threshing wheat on their threshing-floor, and David, with his elders, came clothed in sackcloth and prostrated themselves before the Angel of the Lord! That was the place for the Temple of the Lord, and this the man to provide all things necessary for its building. Here is to stand the Altar which should carry on to succeeding generations the glorious news that "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction," should in the fulness of time be made "for the sins of the whole world." Here the Holy of Holies into which the annual entry of the High Priest should typify the Saviour's Resurrection and Ascension into the holiest realms, bearing His Own Crucified Glorified Body, an earnest that we should follow and be with Him where He is. Here should be the veil of partition which should represent the wall of separation between Jew and Gentile—the veil to be rent—the wall to be thrown down for ever in the sacrifice of the Death of Christ. Here then on Ornan's threshing-floor were to be represented and exhibited to a wondering world, to be unfolded to all coming ages the truths upon which the Salvation of man is based. And all upon a spot which in the first instance seems only to tell of sin—the sin of a king, of a saint, of a prophet, of one who sometimes even exercised priestly functions, of the sweetest Psalmist that ever wrote and sang—the sin of a people, a peculiar people, miraculously preserved and set apart as the very elect of the Most High. But though it was a spot thus desecrated by sin, it was ennobled by pardon, by grace, by mercy, by penitence, by contrition, by trust. And what else does the Gospel of Christ teach us, but just all this? Does it not teach us that we, we too, are sinners indeed, unworthy of pardon and salvation? But does it not also teach that in Jesus forgiveness is found, rest, and joy and peace, promise of future blessings—blessings without end? Aye, even a very paradise of joy, a restoration of primal innocence, the protection of Angels, the society of the blessed, a shrine whose beauty is the joy of the whole earth and of heaven too!

The Wandsworth Common Act, 1871, secured to Lord Spencer, in full discharge of all his manorial rights, a perpetual annuity of £250, payable out of the local rates. This annuity Lord Spencer sold to Sir Henry Peek, who has just made it over to the Queen Anne's Bounty-office in augmentation of the living of Rousdon, Devon, to which the Rev. John Curgenven, M.A., for many years curate of Lyme Regis, has lately been presented.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1881.

BIOLOGY AND DIVINTY.

IT may seem startling that we should refer divinity students to Professor Huxley's Address at the International Medical Congress for a full and firm grasp of the great truths of Revealed Religion. We do so because the Professor has given an eloquent, succinct, and accurate history of the science of living matter from the days of Aristotle down to the latest discovery of the cell-theory, free, for the most part, from technical language and details. René Descartes, the contemporary of Harvey, was the first to propound that all vital phenomena are, in their ultimate analysis, resolvable into matter and motion. He was not a mere theorist, but a hard-working dissector and experimenter, and believed in the practical value of his researches. He speaks of the importance of preserving health, and of the dependence of the mind on the body being so close that perhaps the only way of making men wiser and better than they are is to be sought in sanitary science. His proposition that the human body is a machine whose actions are explicable by the known laws of matter and motion, is largely true; but it is also true that it is a synthesis of innumerable living cells, each of which is susceptible of structural growth and repair, and that the only machinery is that which co-ordinates and regulates these living units into an organic whole. "In fact, the body is a machine of the nature of an army, not that of a watch, or of a hydraulic apparatus. Of this army, each cell is a soldier, an organ a brigade, the central nervous system the head-quarters and field telegraph, the alimentary and circulatory system the commissariat. Losses are made good by recruits born in camp, and the life of the individual is a campaign, conducted successfully for a number of years, but with certain defeat in the long run. The efficacy of an army, at any given moment, depends on the health of the individual soldier, and on the perfection of the machinery by which he is led and brought into action at the proper time; and, therefore, if the analogy holds good, there can only be two kinds of diseases, the one dependent on abnormal states of the physiological (living) units, the other on perturbation of their co-ordinating and alimentative machinery." What an apt illustration is this of the Church! Surely a knowledge of these facts will explain why our religion tends to redeem the body as well as the soul; why it begins with sanitary institutions under Abraham and Moses; why the more spiritual portion of it was revealed by Christ, under the similitude of bread, flesh, and blood; and why great spiritual truths have been expounded and enforced by metaphors and similes taken from the vital processes of the human body. Maybe, the careful study of this Address will help forward the right solution of the Contagious Diseases Question; certainly it will promote true Church-building, the specification of which was so wisely and so boldly set out by Canon Rawstorne in our last number.

ADDRESS TO SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS.

By the Rev. G. E. WATKINS.

(Concluded from page 107.)

Let me sum up my remarks on the two essential qualifications of a Sunday-school Teacher—viz., the grace of charity, of constraining love, and the spirit of self-sacrifice and self-denial—in as few words as will suffice to link what follows with what has gone before.

I have thus far endeavoured to show that the primary qualification of Sunday-school Teachers is love to their Master and love for their scholars; that from this double motive springs love for the work—love of such strength, zeal of so warm a glow, as to lead them ungrudgingly to the exercise of the self-negation and self-denial which is involved in its discharge.

Before proceeding to the next point—the power of sympathy—it is pertinent to the subject to observe that the first principle treated of—love for the work, springing from love to Him whose work it is, and those for whom we work—is capable of cultivation to such a degree of intensity as we advance in grace, and become more and more imbued with the mind of Christ, that after a time the Christian Teacher ceases to consider any sacrifice too hard to make, any hardship too great to be incurred, in the interests of his scholars. Indeed, such acts of self-denial become a source of satisfaction and delight, and are not regarded any longer as privations sadly forced on him by the necessities of the work.

He can then say with St. Paul (2 Cor. v. 14), "The love of Christ constraineth me;" and as that zealous Apostle was daunted by no difficulties, discouraged by no rebuffs (2 Cor. iv. 8-9), disheartened by no failures, turned aside by no apprehensions of personal danger (2 Cor. xi. 23-27), swayed by no selfish motives or motives of mere expediency, checked by no apprehension of the taunts or threatenings of his foes—so the Christian Teacher, strong in the consciousness of his interest of his work, assured of the approbation of One singleness of purpose, wrapt up in the absorbing higher than the sons of men, can say with St. Paul, "Wherefore we labour that we may be accepted of Him" (2 Cor. v. 9), taking pleasure in infirmities, reproaches, &c. (2 Cor. xii. 10), for Christ's sake.

III. The power of sympathy is also a requisite for the successful teacher: sympathy in teaching, as well as in personal intercourse with his class. This power of sympathy is one which every teacher should earnestly seek to acquire. That it can be acquired in greater or less degree, there is little doubt. Close and earnest observation of the needs and difficulties of our

hearers, combined with a loving spirit and a strong desire to help, is the way to cultivate this power. No better sphere than the Sunday-school can be suggested for its culture, and no more useful or important sphere can be found for its exercise. We have to bring our minds to bear on the minds of those whom we are endeavouring to teach. By the inculcation of precept, by earnest exhortation, by the force of example, by direct contact with our scholars, our minds and characters act upon theirs, our words and actions influence and inspire them. That is the effect of all teaching—intellectual, moral, and religious. But in giving doctrinal instruction, in educating the youthful mind in religious truth, this principle goes further; the power of sympathy has greater scope than in the inculcation of abstract moral duties, based on any science of ethics of human origin.

As Sunday-school Teachers you are endeavouring to train souls for heaven, as well as teaching your scholars how to regard life on earth; you wish them to grow in grace, and in favour with God as well as with man; you are seeking to release and turn them from the slavery of sin and Satan, and the service of the world, to the free and voluntary service of Christ; to win them from the pursuits of time and the things of this lower life, and to prepare them for an eternity with God.

What are the personal qualifications you require for such a work? What will enable you to succeed in such a calling? How will you obtain the power of influencing them for their good? In order to present the truth plainly, forcibly, and persuasively before the minds of your young charge, you will require a vivid grasp of that truth in your own soul. Spiritual work requires spiritual agents.

IV. An indispensable qualification for a Sunday-school Teacher is, therefore, personal religion, experimental knowledge of the Truth. A sense of the solemnity of eternal things is not sufficient. A sincere and unfeigned desire for the good of others does not of necessity imply fitness for the work. A benevolent disposition may exist without any change of *heart* having taken place. The desire to do what we consider good does not of necessity imply the existence of true life in the soul, nor must we impute every kind impulse to the direct impulse of the Spirit, till we have become in all things spiritually-minded.

V. One of the evidences of spiritual life is a spirit of prayer, which again is an essential qualification of the Sunday-school Teacher. He needs to be prayerful for himself, since personal religion is essential to true and efficient teaching. He must pray for a blessing on his work and on those in whose instruction he is engaged. We should bring before Him who seeth in secret every hope and every disappointment concerning our work. We are fellow-labourers with Him. He desires to possess our confidence, and encourages us to pour into His attentive ear every hope of success and every fear of failure, every detail of our plans, every dawning of hope or shade of despondency, each fresh step projected in our undertaking. We must pray for our scholars, as well as on our own behalf. They have souls to be saved or lost for ever, to be in joy or misery in an eternal world. And their eternal condition depends very much upon the influence which their teacher exercises upon their minds. However thorough and diligent your preparation, however earnest and faithful your teaching, however good and consistent an example you set, you will not thereby secure the salvation of your scholars. You require the special blessing of God to come down and convert them. Secret and unceasing prayer to God for the souls under your care is the best and most likely means to secure that blessing; and when you pray, *expect* an answer. The prayer of faith is that which God undertakes to reward in the promise—"What things soever ye ask in faith, believing, ye shall receive" Prayer can give power to the words we speak, bring down a blessing on our instructions, and send them home to the hearts of our hearers with a force which only the Divine blessing can impart. Thus they shall come to our hearers like a message from above. The thought that from us the souls of our hearers will be required, should send us often to the throne of grace in fervent supplication that our scholars may profit by our instructions, and that we may thus be able hereafter to render a joyful account of the trust committed to our charge. Does not the necessity of this qualification show that those who teach should have themselves been taught by the Spirit—should themselves be true servants of the Lord? For how can one who knows nothing of the Shepherd, and who is not himself one of the flock, undertake to guide Christ's lambs into the fold? A stranger to the right way cannot lead another into the path, and strangers to personal religion can neither edify the young inquirer nor restore the wilful backslider.

VI. Earnestness is another qualification for Sunday-school teaching: one of the greatest importance, and following naturally from the possession and continual cultivation of the last. Strive your utmost to make your class feel something of your own earnestness. Endeavour to overcome the natural heedlessness of youth, by showing them the risk run by the thoughtless, by pointing out to them their danger. Teach those young immortal spirits to seek their Saviour early.

Earnestness is necessary to enable us to overcome the difficulties and the hindrances which meet us at every step. Earnestness is not mere bustle and excitement, the energy of a moment, which some passing trifle may have called into existence, but an active, quiet, persevering diligence, coupled with a warm and zealous ardour, not giving up when difficulties appear, but with patient labour overcoming every obstacle. We should be earnest from a consideration of the importance and blessedness of a work which has for its object the conversion of souls. We should be earnest, because God in His Holy Word forbids sloth, and encourages us to be active in all our pursuits, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord. God delights to honour the faithful and zealous labourer in His cause, while His blessing will never rest on the feeble and intermittent labours, the spasmodic efforts of the indolent. This should be understood and remembered by every teacher. Without earnestness, our teaching will not make any adequate and lasting impression. We need to be earnest in mind and in manner, since a teacher who lacks the spirit of earnestness cannot hope for success. This qualification of earnestness will lead us naturally to the consideration of how we may best prepare ourselves for the work.

VII. The earnest-minded teacher will be careful to have his lesson thoroughly and thoughtfully prepared.

While the indifferent teacher is apathetic, listless, and unprepared, his manner, on the other hand, will be engaging and impressive. He will be full of warmth and vigour, and his class consequently full of interest in the lesson. His scholars will have that personal

regard for their teacher which leads them to meet him in class, at home, or elsewhere, with pleasure and satisfaction.

It is not an easy task to clothe the truths we have to teach in language simple enough to gain for them an entrance into the mind and heart of a child. It is a qualification which can only be obtained by great care and painstaking. We should seek to present our instructions under every variety of form and illustration, so as to make sure that they are not misunderstood. Hence the importance of preparing for the Sunday class, of having our minds stored with materials for the work, and our hearts warm with an interest in our subject. This can only be done by careful and patient examination of the lesson we have to teach, beforehand ; by attention to little things in reference to it ; the meanings of words, explanation of terms, illustration of manners and customs different from those amongst ourselves, and the division of our subject into sections for separate treatment.

It is simplicity of teaching we have to study, to know how to break up the Bread of Life into crumbs, to feed the little ones as they are able to bear it, and to build them up to the fulness of the stature of Christ.

VIII. Earnest study of the Scriptures is another requisite for the teacher. There is doubtless a great lack of knowledge of Scripture as a *whole*, prevalent amongst Sunday-school Teachers ; a mere superficial acquaintance with the Word of God is the extent of the knowledge of many in the present day, who have had opportunities of acquiring a much deeper spiritual and experimental knowledge of it, as well as a familiarity with its style, arrangement, and general contents.

In the study of God's Word, we need the supernatural teaching of the Spirit of God, which is granted to those who seek it. And who has so much need to seek it as the teacher of youth ? To be successful in teaching, we have need of that spiritual insight into the Word which only God can afford us. Without that insight, how can we hope permanently to influence and touch the hearts of others ?

Even more essential than the qualifications which we bring to our work, is the spirit in which it is carried on.

And this brings me back to the point from which I started, viz., the only satisfactory and sufficient motive which can justify—as it will naturally lead to—our engaging in Sunday-school work.

To bear the Master's scrutiny, it must be done in the same spirit in which He worked. Let us try to imitate Him, in the high estimation which He formed of the work He had to do. Let us endeavour to know thoroughly what we teach, as He did. Let us strive to catch somewhat of His self-consecrating spirit—working because He loved His work—and so let our love be shown in the kindness of heart, the gentleness of manner in which we teach, leading us to manifest our patience and sympathy with the failings of our hearers. Yet more : let us *live* our lessons as He our Master did, Whose voice and Whose life spoke the same truth. Our work is worthy of our every effort. We may not see its results now : He whom we serve wisely conceals them from us ; but one day, when the things of time shall be looked at in the clearer and fuller light of eternity, we shall realise how glorious has been the object and the result of that work, even as we feel now something of the responsibility of those who are called to labour in Christ's vineyard.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—Your correspondent "E. T." cannot be a resident in a large town, or he would scarcely assert that "man goes out of his way to buy," nor talk of endowing him with a "selling power." In large towns women, and even girls, literally thrust themselves on men returning home, it may be, after indulging too freely in wine. Many of these females persist in the life year after year, in spite of every effort of "midnight missionaries," magistrates, hospital authorities, and others. It is absurd to assert that any woman practises prostitution from poverty ; and while I have no wish to excuse my sex, daily experience convinces me that in this respect they are often more sinned against than sinning. The Royal Commissioners reporting in 1871 on this point say : "Many witnesses have urged that, as well on grounds of justice as expediency, soldiers and sailors should be subjected to regular examination. We may at once dispose of this recommendation, so far as it is founded on the principle of putting both parties to the sin of fornication on the same footing, by the obvious but not less conclusive reply that there is no comparison to be made between prostitutes and the men who consort with them. With the one sex the offence is committed as a matter of gain ; with the other it is an irregular indulgence of a natural impulse." To this let me add that, as regards propagating disease, there can be no comparison whatever between the sexes. A man cannot communicate this disease (as a rule) to any female without more or less physical pain to himself; but a woman may infect scores or even hundreds of men without any pain to herself, and even before she is aware that she is diseased. Hence the necessity for the periodical examination of all prostitutes if we are to prevent these diseases. And if there were a class of men analogous to them, by all means let them be examined too. "E. T." must be quite ignorant of two clauses of the Act of 1866. One, Clause 12, is: "A hospital shall not be certified under this Act unless at the time of the granting of a certificate adequate provision is made for the moral and religious instruction of the women detained therein under this Act ; and if at any subsequent time it appears to the Admiralty or the Secretary of State for War that in any such hospital adequate provision for that purpose is not made, the certificate of that hospital shall be withdrawn." Clause 27 runs : "Every woman shall on her discharge from the hospital be sent to the place of her residence, if she so desires, without expense to herself."

In his Parliamentary Paper, the Rev. E. P. Grant, Vicar of Portsmouth, says :—

"There is no point in connection with the patients, in the lock wards, in which the committee of management are more deeply interested, and more strongly insist upon, than in the efforts that are made to reclaim the women who come into the hospital. A chaplain is appointed, whose duty it is to visit the wards every day, and who conducts Divine Service in them once on the Sunday. In choosing a matron, the committee always have regard to the good influence which she is likely to exercise over the patients, and they have hitherto been most happy in this respect ; and every opportunity is given to the patients by careful classi-

fication, close supervision, generally good influence, and personal attention to individual cases on the part of the chaplain or matron, of recovering themselves, and either returning to their friends or entering penitentiaries. During the year 1876, 55 patients were sent from the lock wards into penitentiaries, most of whom the matron has reason to believe are doing well, and 33 were sent home to their friends. Outside the hospital there is one penitentiary, and one receiving-house, in which girls are either received from the hospital or taken direct from the streets, and a certain amount of good is being done by both. Another 'Refuge' has been opened in the town since the above was written."

In another place he says: "I most strongly, and on religious grounds most especially advocate the extension of the Acts." Having personally visited the hospitals at Aldershot, Chatham, and Devonport, I can testify that the same influences are at work in all; and from correspondents I learn that they are also to be found at the hospitals in Cork, Kildare (near the Curragh Camp), in short, in all the hospitals under the working of these Acts. I could add more, but I hope I have said enough to show "E. T." that he is not justified in the concluding paragraph of his letter. The Government provide these women with all facilities for abandoning their wretched life. It is by human means that any good can be effected in this world, not by visionary schemes which ignore the evils in our midst. If any of these women return to their vicious life, no Government and no philanthropists can prevent them; this is not in consequence but in spite of these greatly maligned but most valuable Acts. Their object is to prevent disease, and to assert that they only provide "healthy indulgence in sin for the wicked" is as untrue as it is illogical.

A SURGEON.

25th August, 1881.

SIR,—I did not intend to trouble your readers again, my desire being not to discuss the question in your columns but merely to let your readers know, as clearly as I am able, that the opponents of the Contagious Diseases Acts do not confine themselves to the moral (sometimes called "sentimental") side of the question, but that they distinctly join issue with the supporters of the Acts on legal and also on scientific grounds. But when a correspondent who signs himself "a Surgeon" states that "it has been proved *beyond all dispute* before a Royal Commission, &c., that these diseases have been considerably reduced in the army, navy, among the women subject to the Acts and in the civil population where they are in force," it is necessary to point out to an unwary reader that he is intended to draw the inference of himself that this asserted diminution of disease is due to the Acts. The opponents of the Acts with all this, and more, evidence before them, assert that the diminution, where it exists, is *not* due to the action of the Acts. Counter-assertion, you will say. Exactly so. My object is to induce your readers not to form their opinions upon the *ex parte* statements of anonymous writers, but to go to the fountain head and read the evidence for themselves. It is easy to obtain. If they are unwilling or unable to do this, let them reserve their decision; or if they are influenced by the opinion of others, let them look at this one fact, that a medical man, a member of the Royal Commission has since joined the Repeal Association; and let them read the opinions of numerous scientific men of great eminence, which have been published, both for and against the Acts; they will then see that the science, and the wisdom, and the knowledge of the facts is not, to say the least of it, monopolized by the supporters of the Acts. It may also be well to say that the opponents to the Acts do not, as a body, object to all legislation on the subject; what they object to are certain provisions in the present Acts. It should not be forgotten that the Royal Commission recommended the Repeal of the present Acts and the passing of fresh ones, and that they differed very materially among themselves as to the kind of legislation which was required. I wish you would furnish your readers with the published opinions of eminent men, living and dead, on this question, giving say half-a-dozen opinions, each week, on each side. Those on the one side are published by the Repeal Association in a collected form.

W. M. MOORSOM.

Lorne Villa, Clevedon, Aug. 24.

SIR,—As to whether the sin in man or woman is greatest, is rather a subtle question. Man is more passionate, but woman is more credulous. Then large classes of women are exempt. *No class* of men. Women that are ignorant and uncultured, sin. *Men* of the highest culture and education; the sin is greater for *them*. "Men *never* make a trade of sin?" Don't they? How is it in proscribed districts they keep houses of ill-fame? It is said that is illegal. Then what is the meaning of an extract from the pamphlet received to-day:—"Twenty-eight at once gave up the keeping of *houses*, and two who *refused* were upon representation being made deprived of their *pensions*." If there is no "street solicitation" there must be places of ill-resort. That Jewesses and numbers of women are exempt shows us that women *can* be virtuous; but why say that reformation must be brought about by them alone, when men are the chief defaulters, and when a *certain class* exist on account of *their* vices, as well as woman's frailty? About the *Irish* there is no such supervision as you imagine—I know them very well. If two poor people want to marry, the only impediment is generally the £1 to pay the priest. The priests try to put down *mixed* marriages; they seldom occur, on account of class religion and class prejudices. If there *was* a difficulty put in the way of marriage, it would tend rather to further prostitution. The priests are particular in cases of seduction to make the parties marry, which is often done; if not, however, the girl oftenest recovers herself (at least about here), and if she leads a respectable life afterwards, she is not put under a ban, nor excluded from acquaintance, though she has a bad chance of getting married; in fact, the thing is considered a disgrace, therefore it is not *done*. It is not generally considered a disgrace for men—it is done—inevitable consequence. There can be no worse sign of the national conscience than this deadness. There can be no creed worse for men than to tell them "reformation does not lie with you." Some men *are* exempt—not differently constituted from their fellows, nor better than them in other respects. Effect of example and training—showing that men *can* be virtuous too. With your "able subscriber," I think I would go entirely with you if you were in favour of the Act being applied to men, and a legal penalty attached to disease also. It puzzles me unaccountably how it is that you don't see the justice of the claim, as well as its necessity. If the number of dissolute men did not exceed that of women, the

strength of the whole nation would not be sapped by the foul poison as it is now. Is there *no* justice to be regarded where women are concerned? Is the curse that befell Eve to continue for ever? But in this "enlightened age" there is a far more ghastly curse than that. Men and women are blighted in their spring time, or in their prime, by premature corruption. There is something *horrible* about the curse on the innocent. There is a great deal of pity for "unfortunates," false sentiment, I think. Many of them come from homes where care and affection was bestowed upon them, but they outrage all pure domestic ties; they live in violation of all laws, moral and religious; they care not how they spread disease, death, or infamy, led on by two all-powerful impulses—the greed of lust and the greed of gold—and men are their accomplices. I fear it is not in the power of man or woman to devise any means of eradicating a widespread evil without being strongly supported by public opinion and that of the *leaders of thought*; you might as well try to stem an incoming tide or change the bed of the ocean. It is the people that make the laws, and unless we can move them we are powerless. A good deal may be done by appeal to the "conscience of the age," and public discussion is necessary for this.

AN IRISHWOMAN.

August 26th, 1881.

SIR,—I was afraid, in writing the other day, that I should occupy too much space in your columns, if I did more than touch upon the laws passed about women in 1866 and 1869, as regarded from our point of view. Can you, however, once more spare me a little space to comment upon your article of August 6th. I see there, "there is one seemingly strong objection to the Acts given, viz., that they are one-sided in their operation, and show a favouritism to men as against women, and this, in the minds of many men as well as women, is but partially met by *the fact that the subjected women alone make a trade of vice.*" Now this sentence, which was, I am sure, written in good faith, I at the same time maintain contains a fallacy, very generally believed, but absolutely false. I do not claim to have any very large or peculiar experience, but I have for some few months been in the habit of visiting in houses of ill-fame in a very notorious quarter of London. Those houses were in many instances, I know, kept by men. Hanging about them were a gang of young men of bad appearance, without any ostensible means of living whatever, who yet nevertheless lived. I maintain that the keepers of those houses, and those young men, who either procured their tenants or procured customers for their tenants, may very fitly indeed be called traders in vice. I refer any reader who doubts as to men being traders in vice, and traders to a very large amount, to the extracts in the *Daily Telegraph* of August 26th, from the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords relative to the protection of young girls, or, better still, to that Report itself. I would refer them also to the recent convictions in Belgium, where men, in equal numbers with women, have been convicted of trading in vice. I would ask under what category are to be placed the "bullies" of Portsmouth, where, as far as I am aware, each poor girl on the streets supports some, in my opinion, yet more wretched man by her ill-gotten gains. And I would venture to suggest that women are as a rule not the traders in vice, but the article traded in. There are men in fashionable London clubs, who always have enough money for their pleasures, though none exactly know how they come by it. Would it be too much for me to say that, at all events in one case, such a man makes a practice of consoling the cast-off mistress of some spendthrift friend, until he has secured or pawned all her objects of value, on which he in his turn casts her off penniless and broken-hearted? What title should be given to the gentlemen who regularly procure girls for their richer and grander acquaintances? Do not all these men make a trade of vice, not to speak of others who shall be unmentioned, because by men their sin is considered so much darker? I think that a great cloud is cast over this subject by the often repeated assertion that "women alone make a trade of vice." One might almost as well say that women "alone make a trade of hotel-keeping," because in each hotel the traveller finds a number of chambermaids, and only one proprietor, this last sometimes a man, and sometimes a woman.

Jeremy Taylor, in his "Holy Living and Dying," has some very noteworthy sentences on the comparative guilt of men and women who commit fornication. I do not think they can be improved upon, and some of your correspondents who have touched upon this subject, may be glad to be referred to them. Whatever that may be, however, the laws of 1866 and 1869 were most distinctly passed *not for the benefit* of women, but for the benefit of men—the men of our army and navy. These laws treat of women only. Whatever incidental benefit may "eventually" arise for women, I think it is a new thing to legislate about women with the sole intention of benefiting men, and without considering the effect upon women. Anyone referring to the debates in either House at the time, as given in Hansard, may easily assure himself that this was the case. There was no word then spoken of moral reclamation, of improved order in the streets, nor of *benefit to unborn children.* Indeed these laws were passed for the protection of the class of men least likely to beget children of any in the community, because in most instances *forbidden to marry, i.e.*, soldiers. If they had been intended for the benefit of innocent children yet unborn, would they not rather have been passed in manufacturing towns, where there is much immorality, and where men and women marry early and beget many children, rather than in garrison and seaport towns, where sailors are separated from their wives by circumstances, and soldiers by military regulations? There is one consequence they obviously must have upon the whole body of women. They of necessity must increase the number among them, who either trade in or are traded with for purposes of vice. If a jeweller suddenly altered his method of business, and at any time sent any number of bracelets to be detained any time in country houses, instead of keeping all his stock in his shop on show, he would necessarily have to increase his stock in trade in order to meet the demand should the demand remain at all the same. The keepers of houses of ill-fame are liable now, in twenty of our towns, at any moment to have any number of their girls taken away from them and detained any indefinite time. They must of necessity have more girls to meet the demand, if it remains the same. There is no gainsaying this. The compulsory removal and detention in hospital of women gives a stimulus to the seeking-out of others. Regarding it, as I do, as a great misfortune for all

women that any of their number should be so degraded as to sell for money what ought to be above price, I regard any law that tends to increase the number of women so doing as a great misfortune for all. Whether the number upon the register rises or falls is no indication as to how many women are sinning or not. It much rather tells whether the police officials are energetic, stern, and vigilant; or lazy, pitiful, and careful rather not to get themselves into trouble than to get on. A year or two ago the police of Paris estimated the women solely living by sin as about 30,000; of these, even with the arbitrary powers accorded in Paris, they had only 4,000 and odd on the register. When I was last in Plymouth I saw in the principal street a deserted shop; I was told on enquiry that when a descent was made upon this shop, every girl in it was sent to hospital, but till then the name of not one girl in it had been on the register.

Everyone knows how sometimes convictions for being drunk and disorderly will suddenly mount up in a given town, and how they will again suddenly drop down. No moral reform has been worked in the neighbourhood. Simply the police officials have been changed, or have adopted a different method of acting. Everything that tends to lower the position of women in a nation, makes it additionally hard for those who wish to earn their bread honestly to do so. In France it is so general for a girl to eke out the pittance she earns honestly by other means, that in many cases an employer would not hesitate to tell a new girl so. Our shop-girls may be easily brought into the same position.

Everything that tends to improve the position of women living by sin is an additional temptation to other girls to join their number. I may be thought cruel, but I say frankly I would rather see the woman who lives by sin looking the vile, wretched creature she is, rather than as I have seen her coming out of the examination room at Plymouth, very quietly and tastefully dressed, looking more modest, and quite as ladylike as any daughter of a good county family would be likely to appear. Every girl openly soliciting in a subjected town is understood to be healthy. This health guarantee probably increases custom, or why do fashionable houses of ill-fame in London pay a surgeon to do for their inmates precisely what we all pay surgeons to do for the women of the town in subjected towns? They certainly do not do it out of a disinterested love for humanity, but because they thus get steadier custom, or better paying. Every girl leading a life of vice in subjected towns knows that as soon as she is ill she will be supported and cured at the national expense in a really first-rate hospital, until believed to be quite well again. Many a hard-worked mother of a family would indeed be thankful to be sure of this hospital accommodation against any illness—slight or grave—brought on by her way of life. But on the contrary, if she even be infected with the very disease those special hospitals treat, through the sin of her husband, she will find her plea for a bed there rejected if there be but one vacancy, and the preference given to the sinful girl who has communicated disease to her husband, and for whose convenience—as long as she continues her *trade (?)*—that hospital has been erected, not for poor, suffering, *but honest* wives and mothers.

I feel that I have written at too great length, but this last distinction cannot fail to be very terribly instructive to a woman, when, as in my own case, I have seen in a voluntary ward of the Harrow-road Lock Hospital, a poor woman in an advanced and most revolting state of disease, having only just succeeded in *at last* obtaining admission. She, poor thing, was an honest working woman, only suffering through her husband's fault, and therefore of no value to the nation. To provide hospital accommodation for such as her, a wife and mother, what nation would consent to pay taxes? In the other State-supported wards rows of girls—to the casual observer apparently in possession of splendid health—rose to their feet, and stood at 'tention, as I looked round. They had had no difficulty in obtaining an entrance. They could not be sent away uncured, however much trouble and annoyance they might give, free of expense, until able to resume their way of life again; they stood and smiled at me. Was it strange that I interpreted that smile to mean:—"You see who the nation considers of value, who it willingly taxes itself to cure and keep in good health. We are the only kind of women whose health is a care to men?" And I thought of that poor suffering woman on the other side, indebted to charity for a place to die in, and I felt if there be one place in all London which God's good angels pass but enter not, it was that ward where I was standing, where women are drilled and taught that it is the abandoned woman alone whose health is worth paying for, that she alone is a necessity, and wives and mothers of no account.

A. E. N. BEWICKE.

[No doubt more men than women carry on general trades in vice, but we indicated (July 2nd) a specially dangerous one carried on by women only, who prostituted for gain their persons when in a state of disease, and expressed the opinion that it was justifiable to place them under inspection, just as other less dangerous trades were. Miss Bewicke understands this, as the end of her letter shows, which is valuable not only as contradicting the beginning, but also the cruel hardships, and outrages, and imprisonments the "unfortunates" are said by her Repeal Association to suffer under the Acts! An Irishwoman's letter is conceived in such an excellent and true womanly spirit, that we have ventured to print it, although not marked for publication. We look to women to aid us in stamping out this horrible disease; they have more control over men than they seem to be conscious of, and it is more to their interest to do so, because if they marry in any station of life, they are liable to have their own and the health of their offspring blighted for generations. Want of space will preclude our complying with Mr. Moorsom's suggestion; we adhere to the opinion we have expressed on the scientific evidence *against*, that in favour of the Acts comprises more than 99 per cent. of the medical profession. If the opponents really have more effective legislation to offer in the interests of health and morals, let them propound it *before* the existing most successful Acts are repealed.—Ed.]

The Bishop of London lately admitted twenty laymen in the chapel of Fulham Palace to the office of lay-readers. They were presented to the Bishop by the vicars of the parishes in which they were to officiate. The *Church Times* says that the Bishop received those presented to him nearly in the formula of the ordinal of the diaconate. The candidates then knelt before him, when he severally delivered into their

hands the New Testament, saying, "Take thou authority to read and expound the Holy Scriptures where thou shalt be appointed to serve." The service then proceeded with a portion of that used in the ordination of deacons, and the Benediction having been pronounced, the Bishop delivered an excellent address to the readers on the duties of their office. Amongst those receiving the Bishop's licence was a member of the council of the Church of England Working Men's Society.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has collated the Rev. J. P. Norris, B.D., Canon Residentiary of Bristol Cathedral, to the Archdeaconry of Bristol, vacated by the decease of the Ven. Archdeacon Randall. Mr. Norris is vicar of St. Mary Redcliffe, and the author of "Rudiments of Theology" and theological works; his "New Testament, with introductions and Notes," was lately reviewed in these columns. Mr. Norris took his degree in the First Class of the Classical Tripos in 1846, and was sometime a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He will continue to sit in the Southern Convocation, though no longer representing the Chapter of Bristol. He declined the valuable living of Christian Malford, which had not long been held by his predecessor, Archdeacon Randall.

The Bishop of Bangor, in the course of his triennial Charge, delivered at Bangor, is stated to have said he could not disguise his feelings of shame and indignation at the manner in which lay ecclesiastical patronage was exercised. Most unfit and incompetent men were preferred for livings owing to political sympathy or family ties, and when inducted they alienated Churchmen by indifference and negligence. He hoped the time would come when the parishioners would at least have a negative voice in the selection of the man to whom their spiritual welfare was intrusted. The advertisements of sales of livings in ecclesiastical journals were scandalous. The Bishop concluded his Visitation on Friday at Machynlleth. His lordship's remarks on lay patronage on the opening day at Bangor Cathedral having been considerably misrepresented, Dr. Campbell, according to the *Morning Post*, made the following observations:—"The weak point of the Church, which was a city set on a hill and could not be hidden, was discipline. In some instances there was no power to cast out those who caused offences to the Church, and this was to be greatly regretted. Considered in the abstract, there was something about the parochial system which commanded admiration, but abuse required to be carefully guarded against, and there should be the means of correcting mistaken appointments to parishes by the immediate removal of a clergyman who was an unfaithful shepherd and neglected his flock. It was, unhappily, notorious that family ties and political sympathies governed, in too many instances, the appointments to benefices. The Bishops were sometimes blamed because an unfit person was placed in charge of a parish, but a Bishop could not possibly have a personal knowledge of every candidate who offered himself for ordination, and he was therefore, to a great measure, dependent upon the knowledge possessed by others. It was far easier to expose an evil than to devise a remedy. It seemed at least reasonable that the people should have a negative voice in the appointment of their clergyman, but under the law as it now stood that was impossible. A clergyman might break the vows made by him upon his ordination, and he might neglect his duties, and surround himself with callous indifference towards the full and proper discharge of his sacred office, knowing that he was secure in his benefice. The lay patronage of the diocese of Bangor had been so purely administered that he wished to guard himself against the possibility of casting adverse reflection where it was unmerited, and the patronage of the Crown had been equally conscientious; but he could not shut his eyes, or refrain from expressing his feelings of shame and indignation, at what was going on elsewhere, and especially at the advertisements in ecclesiastical papers for the sale of advowsons which were appearing, and which must shock the feelings of every true Christian."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Boothby, Rev. William, assistant-curate of St. Matthew, Duddeston; assistant-curate of St. Clement, Nechells.
Bradshaw, Rev. Sandys Ynyr Burgess, rector of St. Stephen's, Hulme; vicar of Holy Trinity, South Shore, Blackpool.
Cook, Rev. Henry Lucas, vicar of St. Mark, Low Moor, Bradford.
Henderson, Rev. H. G., incumbent of Holy Trinity, Shoreditch; rector of East Mersea.
Hussey, Rev. Edward, curate of Earl's Heaton, Leeds; curate of Ringstead St. Andrew, Norfolk.
Kingston, Rev. John, chaplain to the *Serapis*.
Morris, Rev. Thomas Dickin, perpetual curate of Tottington.
Ness, Rev. Francis Henry Derby, assistant-curate of Claines.
Owen, Rev. John Stanley, vicar of St. Paul, Sheerness; vicar of St. Mary, Birmingham.
Ratcliffe, Rev. Charles B., vicar of St. John's in Woodbridge.
Tebbutt, Rev. Henry, vicar of St. Andrew's, Nottingham; prebendary of Leighton Ecclesia, in Lincoln Cathedral.
Thoyts, Rev. Ernest, curate of Burmington.
Thurlow, Rev. Richard, rector of St. James, Shaftesbury, Dorset.
Simmons, Rev. J. F., perpetual curate of South Shore, Preston; perpetual curate of Christ Church, Hull.
Webb, Rev. Perceval; vicar of Portfield by Chichester.
Wilkinson, Rev. Edward, rector of Snargate; incumbent o Christ Church Chapel, Leamington Priors.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Davies, Rev. James, formerly rector of Abbenhall, and rural dean, at Bicknor House, on the 27th ult., in his 96th year.
Ewbank, Rev. George, M.A., of Gonville and Caius Coll., Cambridge, and late lieutenant R.N., at 6, Stanford-road, Brighton, on the 24th ult.
Glover, Rev. Frederick R. A., M.A., formerly captain H.M. 69th Regiment, at Brading, I. W., on the 25th ult., aged 81.
Gower, Rev. John Alexander, M.A., for forty-five years chaplain of Stoke Poges Hospital, Slough, on the 26th ult., aged 77.
Hall, Rev. T. G., M.A., late tutor and fellow of Magd. Coll., Cambridge, and for thirty-eight years professor of mathematics at King's College, London, at Kingshurst, Paignton, on the 26th ult., aged 78.
Minchin, Rev. Henry Charles, M.A., for twenty years vicar of St. Mary de Lode, Gloucester, at [illegible] green, Gloucester, on the 16th ult., aged 69.
Russell, Rev. Cecil, formerly rector of Drumcree, county Westmeath, at Richmond-hill, Monkstown, Dublin, on the 29th ult., aged 78.
Vaughan, Rev. Charles, late rector of Llanhe Valley and Crickader, South Wales, at Dol Peris, Bournemouth, on the 13th ult., aged 76.
Wood, Rev. James, M.A,, forty-two years vicar of Warnham, Sussex, on the 13th ult., aged 76.
Wood, Rev. Thomas Martyn, rector of St. Thomas's Church, St. John's, Newfoundland, in the fiftieth year of his ministry, on the 16th ult., aged 73.
Worsley, Rev. William, at Bratoft Rectory, Lincolnshire, suddenly, on the 26th ult., aged 81.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE LORD'S SONG IN UNBELIEF.

By the Rev. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday Afternoon, August 28th, 1881.

"How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?"—Psalm cxxxvii. 4.

EVERYBODY must see that this psalm, which we have just been singing in the public service, belongs to a much later age than that of David. It is one of several psalms that were really written about the time of the Babylonish captivity; but no one of these psalms has its date so visibly stamped upon the face of it as this. It must have been composed just after the return of the Jews to the holy city by a writer whose mind was still full of the horrors of the exile. One incident, among others, stands out with vivid clearness in his memory. The captive Israelites had been wont to sit on the banks of the rivers which watered the country of their conquerors, gazing at the mighty streams that rolled through that vast plain, and perhaps seeing in them a figure of the ever-advancing stream of time which was bringing the hour of their deliverance nearer and nearer. It was on the banks of two of these rivers, you will remember, the Hiddekel or Tigris and the Chebar, that Daniel and Ezekiel beheld their great visions; and now less celebrated persons, such as this nameless psalmist and his companions, some of whom had probably been members of the Temple choir in Jerusalem, or, at least, had learned its melodies, had crept out of the narrow and thronged ways of the great neighbouring city, and betaken themselves to the favourite resort of their countrymen by the river bank. There they sat during the long hours of the hot Eastern day, silently watching the eddies of the ever-advancing waters, and their thoughts naturally wandered off to that far-distant home and that dearly-loved sanctuary which was now lying waste and desolate, and from which they had been torn away by the ruthless conqueror. When they thought of Zion—Zion, so unlike the scene before them; Zion, with its surrounding hills and its gentle brooks; Zion, with its dear and cherished memories, and with its sanctities hallowed by the reverence of ages—they could no longer command themselves; they wept. High upon the willows which grew along the river banks they hung up their harps—instruments these which, as being traditionally devoted to the expression of joy, had no longer any use in the sad days that had come upon them; they hung up their harps high out of reach, high out of sight, lest, seeing them, the oppressor should repeat his request that his captives would cast aside their sorrow, and would sing the old, joyous, consecrated melodies, which they had neither mind nor heart to sing in Babylon. "For they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion."

The Temple music had a reputation, even among the heathen peoples of Central Asia, and just as the sacred vessels of the Temple were employed to decorate the sideboards of Babylonian monarchs, so it seemed natural and in order to the conqueror that the sacred words and music which had for ages set forth the worship of the one true God should furnish a more refined amusement to the cultivated Pagan who had trodden down the sanctuary and had enslaved God's people. It seemed natural, I say, to the heathen themselves, but the heart of what was still best in captive Israel beat true to what was due to the honour of God and to the memories of their ancient worship. "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning, how still to strike the chords. If I remember thee not, may my tongue cease to sing; may it cleave to the roof of my mouth if I prefer not Jerusalem above all that charms me most. Nay, this request of the heathen oppressor that the captive should sing the Lord's song for his æsthetic gratification nerves the psalmist to a sterner mood. He passes back to the day of Jerusalem—that sad and never-to-be-forgotten day when the city of the Temple was sapped and burned by the army of Nebuchadnezzar. He cannot forget how in those dark hours a race of kinsmen by blood had cheered on the heathen foe in his work of destruction; how the children of Edom, in the day of Jerusalem, said, "Down with it! down with it! even to the ground;" he cannot forget that Babylon then showed itself in its true light as the implacable enemy of God's kingdom upon earth; and in no spirit of mere personal or national vengeance, but as the exponent of a sentence that was strictly Divine, he predicts her ruin. Already he sees the approaching capture of the city by Darius Hysdaspes. Babylon is before his eyes wasted with misery. As he gazes she is herself served as she had served her conquered provinces; her young children are dashed against the stones by the Persian invader; but meanwhile, if the psalmist is asked to prostitute his gift by singing the old Temple songs merely to amuse the heathen, there are many reasons which make compliance impossible. "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" "The Lord's song!" That was what the psalmist could not sing for the gratification of his Babylonian

masters. To Babylon it was only a question of singing the songs of Zion. These songs, it was thought, were what the children of Zion might properly contribute to the amusement of the empire city. Each conquered province, such was their idea, had its speciality; and Judah might just as well bring what it had to give as did the provinces beside it. Evidently the songs of Zion meant one thing to the Babylonian hearer and another to the captive psalmist. To the psalmist they were parts of the sacred worship; their language was sacred. Moses, David, Solomon, Asaph, and more likely Jeremiah, had contributed to it: their ideas were sacred. The true God, His gracious revelation of Himself to Israel, the honour due to Him, the danger of neglecting Him—these were the subjects of Israel's songs. The very music was sacred. It was as old, probably, as the time of Solomon; it had already been hallowed by the use of centuries; it was bound up with the tenderest emotions and associations of many generations. "The Lord's song!" It meant for Israel all that was precious to the soul, but for the Babylonians it meant merely entertainment, merely a newly-imported curiosity, merely a new sensation in the world of art; there was nothing evidently in common to Israel and Babylon in their way of looking at it. "The Lord's song!" Any ancient hymn of king or prophet which had passed into the service of the sanctuary bore that name. There is one prayer with which no other prayer may compare, and which alone in Christendom bears the name of the Lord's Prayer; but there is, at least on earth, no one psalm or hymn which bears the name of the Lord's song. Whatever may be the case with the song of the everlasting future, the religious hymnody of earth is, and always has been, almost infinitely varied in its expression; and yet at bottom it is one in its motive, one in its spirit and its effort, one in its surrounding moral atmosphere. "The Lord's song!" What is it but the ascent of the soul towards the Infinite and the Eternal, the upward bound of the understanding, the expansion of the affections, the effort of faith and hope and love to utter themselves somehow in praise, although the words, the languages, the rythms, the melodies, be most dissimilar? This, the true song of the Lord, springing out of the very heart of the people of revelation, and embodying its creed in poems of the most different ages and characters, it was which could not be uttered for the mere gratification of Pagan Babylon—could not without profanity. "The Lord's song!" If it had been only the old poetry of the heathen, only their ancient music, they might, perhaps, have consented to render it before a Babylonian audience; but for the Jews language was a much more sacred thing, speaking generally, than I fear it is to us. The Jews did not conceive of language as a something which might be stripped of thought like bark from the surface of a tree; for their thought and language always went together. It is, alas! easy for us to utter or to listen to in a concert room the most sacred language as if it meant nothing, as if it were only a sort of padding to the music. But this degradation, if such it is, would have been impossible in a more serious and simple age. The Hebrews could not use their old sacred poetry without thinking of what it meant. As a rule it was the outcome of their deep faith throughout the ages in the one true God; the whole soul of the Hebrew singers went out with it. "The Lord's song!" It sounded through the corridors of the soul before it took shape in language and resounded beneath the vaults of the Temple, and this sense of its reality made it impossible for a good Jew to prostitute it for the benefit of a pagan audience who might think of it as a new sensation in art. "The Lord's song!" Yes; that meant for Israel consecrated art. This is the privilege of art, that it may be hallowed to a divine purpose. Poetry, music, painting, architecture—all have their place in the sanctuary of God. What has once been given to Him is His; His irrevocably; His for ever. The consecrated building cannot be given back to earthly uses without doing Him dishonour, and the poetry or the music which has been dedicated to Him, and which has lifted souls up to Him for many a generation, cannot be divested of its sacred purpose and made the amusement of the unbelieving without wounding Him to whom it was given by the faith and love of the gifted dead.

The psalmist cannot sing that song because he is in a strange land. Let us dwell upon that expression, my brethren. It reveals the motive of the psalmist's silence, and we shall see what the motive of the psalmist's silence is not. It is not sulkiness, moodiness, a determination to inflict upon the Babylonish master such disappointment as is still in the power of his captive and his slave; it is not a subtle pride—the pride of race heightened by the pride which is begotten of failure, the pride which will not accept an invitation to add something to the pleasure and interest of Chaldean life. Nor is it an unreasonable coyness, as was that of the Queen Vashti when, on a great public occasion, she declined the duties of her position in the court of Ahasuerus. Vashti was thinking of herself; but the psalmist, as we shall see, is thinking of One infinitely greater. It was a strange land. This was apparent, first of all, in the difference of the language. Although the Babylonian tongue had affinities with the Hebrew, it was practically for the Jews a foreign language. We know how it affects us when we first go abroad to hear another than our mother tongue being talked all around us; it produces, at least at first, a sense of isolation, and this must have been deepened in the case of the Jews by the fact that they certainly did not go to Babylon for their own satisfaction. How much

this one circumstance of a different language impressed the Jews is plain from the allusions of the prophets. A people of deeper speech than thou canst perceive is, according to Isaiah, one of the dreaded terrors of the captivity; and when Ezekiel is being encouraged to set out on his unwelcome mission to the captive Israelites, it is by being told that he is not sent "to many people of a strange speech and of an hard language, whose words thou canst not understand." In time, no doubt, the captive Jews learned much of the language of their conquerors, and, in fact, brought it back with them to Palestine; but at first it was a barrier between them, and this would itself have made them unwilling to sing the Lord's song in old ancient Hebrew to strangers who could not follow it.

"A strange land." Does not a Christian find himself in it when he finds himself amongst people to whom the language of the Christian creed and the language of the Christian heart are unknown, to whom the language even sounds like an unwelcome and repulsive jargon? The language of religion is and must be unintelligible to those who do not share the faith and the feelings which prompt it. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned. This it is which often makes a Christian when in general company retire into himself lest he should break his Master's precept against giving that which is holy unto the dogs, and casting the pearls of heaven before swine. If the soul is to sing the Lord's song with the lips as well as with the heart, it must be among those who can speak its own language. They rouse its deepest sympathies into more active expression; they follow, they sustain, they stimulate. "My praise shall be of Thee in the great congregation; I will pay my vows before them that fear Him."

"A strange land." Babylon was the land of material wealth, the land of public and private magnificence. Everything in it was on a large scale, especially when compared with Palestine. According to Herodotus the extent of the outer circuit of its walls was about fifty-six English miles, and these walls were strengthened by two hundred and fifty towers. It was entered by one hundred gates; the gates themselves were made of brass, with brazen lintels and side-posts. The great river Euphrates flowed through it, and the quays on each side were of vast extent and beauty. The two buildings in it of commanding splendour were the temple of Belus, or Baal, and the royal palace. Both had been rebuilt by Nebuchadnezzar on a magnificent scale. His name is read at this very hour on the inscribed bricks and on the sculptured fragments which remain. According to one account his palace extended to both sides of the Euphrates. Its separate parts were connected by a bridge and by a tunnel under the bed of the river, while the towers round it rose to a height of four hundred and twenty English feet—that is to say, sixteen feet higher than the cross of St. Paul's. Nor may we forget the "Hanging Gardens" of Nebuchadnezzar, rising in terraces one above the other; and, whatever is to be said in detail as to their dimensions, they were certainly constructed on a magnificent scale. Now all this splendour was quite new to the captive Jews; they had left nothing like it behind them in Palestine. The palace of the descendants of Solomon was a very small thing when compared with the vast edifice in coloured brick, covered all over with the emblems of Semiramis, which was the home of the Babylonian monarch. The scale of the Babylonian court, of the army, of the public works was imperial. Jerusalem was by comparison an insignificant provincial town, or, at best, it was like those little German towns which until lately had their independent courts, when compared with Vienna or with Paris. The literal sense of the words, "Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty," must have forced itself on the captives at their first sight of Babylon. Babylon was the great world-city of the age. Babylon had its attractions, no doubt; but it was not the place in which to sing the Lord's song. The Lord's song proclaimed in its very earliest notes, as witness the one psalm of Moses—*Domine Refugium*—the insignificance of this human life at the best, the poverty and perishableness of all that belongs to time. The soul of man is, after all, finite; and when the soul is filled with this world there is no room for the next. To live for the material is most assuredly to lose hold of the spiritual. When the pride of life flourishes in rank luxuriousness the finer aspirations of the soul have not much, if they have any, chance. The very sight of a splendour which belongs only to time exerts a repressive influence upon the spiritual faculty. As the pious Jews gazed on the wordly magnificence of their conqueror they saw in it a snare and a danger. "Turn away," they said, "mine eyes from beholding vanity, and quicken Thou me in Thy way." "The law of Thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver." "I have seen an end of all perfection; but Thy commandment is exceeding broad." We could not, my brethren, ourselves sing the *Gloria in Excelsis* in the Stock Exchange or in a West-end club, and the Jews felt that Babylon was not the place for singing the song of the Lord which had been the joy and the glory of their ancient sanctuary.

"A strange land!" Babylon was a land in which life was overshadowed by a vast idolatry. What this idolatry was we may see in part by a visit to the British Museum. There are to be seen at this hour figures and inscriptions which might well have been gazed on by the writer of this very psalm, and which show how the Baal worship,

which in its different forms prevailed from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean, was the most striking feature of the life of the imperial races that had conquered Palestine. To this hour the ruins of what was the great temple of Belus within the city, and of the temple of Birs Nimrud without the city, show how powerfully this idolatry must have addressed itself to the sanction of the people; and the same conclusion is warranted by the anxious warnings of Isaiah in anticipation of the captivity, and by the language of the later psalmists who wrote in Babylon. Isaiah describes with a fine and indignant irony how in Babylon the smith with the tongs, and the carpenter with his rule, would combine to make an idol according to the beauty of a man, and how worship would be paid to what was in reality only a stock of a tree. And the psalmist of the later epoch was, we can hardly doubt, inspired to write at the sight of the splendid images in the Babylonian temples, and notably, perhaps, by that of the golden image of Belus. "Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands. They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not; they have ears, but they hear not; noses have they, but they smell not; they have hands, but they handle not; feet have they, but they walk not; neither speak they through their throat. They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them." It was this idolatry which Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego resisted at the risk of their lives, and at which Daniel struck a deadly blow when, according to the Alexandrian account, till lately read in our Churches, and undoubtedly embodying a germ of substantial history, he exposed on a great scale the fraud of the priests of Baal, and destroyed his majesty. And the psalmist feels himself throughout to be confronted by a system of falsehood wielding enormous political and social power, persecuting the servants of the true God when it had an opportunity, and infesting the very air of thought and life with its pervading and its noxious vapours. It is consciousness of this which provokes the devotional intensity of this most gifted and exquisite psalmist. The perpetually reiterated assurances of loyalty to the one true God, to His judgments, to His worship, to His saints—these are so passionate and so tender because he is always conscious of the hateful darkness which reigns around. "Princes have persecuted me without a cause, but my heart standeth in awe of Thy word." "The proud have had me greatly in derision, yet have I not declined from Thy law." "I hate and abhor lying; but Thy laws do I love." "Many are my persecutors and mine enemies; yet do I not decline from Thy testimonies." How could the good old psalmist of Israel, instinct with memories of David's life and of Solomon's glory, and all the solemnities of the now destroyed temple, have sung in such an atmosphere as this? If sacred associations were to have any value; if sacred words were to mean anything, could they be prostituted to the amusement of a race which was devoted to a hideous and cruel superstition? No. Captive Israel might sing the songs of captivity such as was this very hundred and nineteenth Psalm itself—it might sing these in secret assemblies of the faithful, but to render the old Temple hymns before a heathen crowd of idolators was impossible.

My brethren, is not the Christian soul often carried captive nowadays into the Babylon of unbelief or of half-belief? Is not the place in our thoughts which is due to God often tenanted by abstractions which are just as senseless as the idols of Babylon—creations, it is true, of our thoughts, instead of being creations of our fingers? Nature, force, law, and what not, generalisations of our own minds—as we look out upon the universe around us, these are too often placed upon the throne of the One Infinite, Eternal, Self-existent Being; or if any Christianity is left, it is a Christianity which it would seem is too often certain of no one article of the Christian creed, a mere feeble, vague sentiment, a modern Christianity, which is the consecration not of faith, but forsooth of doubt. "Are the Sacraments means of grace?" "There is no saying." "Is the Bible inspired?" "Possibly." "Is the blood of Christ an atoning and a cleasing power?" "Perhaps." "Is Jesus Christ true God as well as true man?" "There is something to be said for it." "Does the Holy Spirit of this our Saviour sanctify the hearts of Christians?" "It is not quite impossible that it does." "Is God three and yet one?" "We must not be too dogmatic about it." "Is He a personal Being, or only a supreme tendency making for righteousness?" "Who shall say, since the literary men hesitate." Oh, brethren, who shall sing the song of the Lord in such a strange land of half-belief as this? To whom are we to sing it? What are we to sing about? How can we go to work at all where all is so vague and uncertain, where nothing is clear above our heads, and where nothing is solid, it would appear, beneath our feet? "The Lord's song," indeed! Certainly, if we are to sing the *Te Deum* or *Gloria in Excelsis* as our fathers did, we must be *bonâ fide* Christians, men who really believe with their whole hearts that the creed of Christendom is true. We may do much else of a different kind, no doubt, in this state of mind which just consents to a tribute of qualified probability to the Christian faith, or to certain parts of it; but as for singing the Lord's song with that kind of sincerity which is owned in heaven, the thing is impossible.

"A strange land!" Babylon was the land of gigantic sins. We see this in the short prophecy of Habakkuk. Habakkuk was shocked and perplexed by the fact that the Babylonians, or Chal-

deans, as he calls them, the conquerors and punishers of the Jews, were more sinful than their victims. "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity; wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he?" Habakkuk describes the sins of the conquering race in sufficient detail—its debauchery, its bloodthirstiness, its stupid and degraded superstitions, its passions, its energy in the propagation of hideous vice; all these form features of his description. There hung over all the magnificence of Babylon a dense atmosphere of sin, which made it impossible for the servant of God to sing his song, to do more than complain, "How long, O Lord, how long?" And the regenerate soul may be carried captive, some of us must know too well, into this Babylon of deadly sin; it may be carried captive, it may at once make its escape and return. Happy are they with whom it fares thus, though the solitary path back across the intervening desert of repentance should be long and should be weary. Happy if their true goal be reached at last, "for then shall they come with songs to Zion, and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads, and sorrow and mourning shall flee away." But supposing that the soul is detained in Babylon, supposing habits of evil are formed, and that the enfeebled will is held down by bolts and bars which it cannot break—then how is it to sing the Lord's song, how is it to mount on the wings of desire and hope to the throne of the All-holy, whose laws it the while sets steadily at defiance? It may utter the words, it may accurately render the musical notation, it may observe the laws of harmony and of time with faultless precision; but what is all this but a frightful mockery if the inner spring of true praise be wanting, if there is nothing to prompt the words which are uttered by the mouth, if it be a case of honouring God with the lips while the heart is far from Him? How can we sing the praises of our Maker if we have not any reason to be thankful to Him for the gift of an undying existence; or the praises of our Redeemer if our hearts do not tell us that we have been washed with His blood and have not defiled our garments; or of our Sanctifier if we know that we have grieved Him, and that He has taken Himself from us? Better far, I had almost allowed myself to say, sing the song of Babylon itself than burn out the last surviving tendencies of the conscience by a service which cannot but be odious to God as it is degrading to ourselves. We may well, indeed, feel, all of us, that this life is an exile from our true home, and that while we live it we cannot, at our best, sing aright the song of the redeemed. The new song of the four awful creatures and of the four-and-twenty elders before the throne of the Lamb—the new song which no man could learn but the forty and four thousand which were redeemed from the earth—the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, which is sung for ever by them that have gotten the victory over the beast, and that stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God—what is all this but a description of the psalmody of the blessed, with the volume and with the brilliancy of which nothing that is heard on earth can compare? Here we sing, as it were, hesitatingly and with snatches since we have most of us been carried captive to some Babylon of worldliness and of unbelief or sin; and there is that which still checks or chokes in us the true voice of the soul. Then when we have reached the seat of our solemnities, then when the gates of the eternal Zion open before us, then when neither the world, nor sin, nor unbelief can mar the freedom of our utterance, we may hope

> "To join our cheerful songs
> With angels round the throne;
> Ten thousand thousand are their tongues,
> And all their joys are one."

ELIJAH ON CARMEL, AND THE WET HARVEST-TIME.

By the Rev. F. TILNEY BASSETT, M.A.,
Vicar of Dulverton, Somerset.

Sermon Preached in Dulverton Church on Sunday Morning, August 28th, 1881.

"Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that Thou art God in Israel."—1 Kings xviii. 36.

THERE are crises and turning-points in the history of nations, of Churches, and of individual men, times when special and severe assaults are directed against them, which end either in defeat and downfall or in deliverance and victory. In the history of nations sin and defection from God and His laws generate weakness and vacillation within, luxury and vice and all the concomitant and consequent evils, and these by a strange but sure fatality provoke and attract the attack of foes from without; it is when the carcase is falling to the ground that the vultures flock together from afar and prepare for the feast. In Churches erroneous doctrines adopted, and necessary ones disregarded or forgotten engender heresy and schism, which in their turn propagate ill-feeling and heart-burnings, jealousies, and separation of the members one from the other, and sometimes even from Christ the Head, and then the candlestick is removed and the light is quenched. In the individual man some special temptation weans from the pursuit of good and lures from the narrow path, then high and holy thoughts and aspirations are forgotten, the broad road is entered on, the course is ever downward, and ends abruptly in the precipice and the pit. Such is the awful termination of the evil chosen and persisted in, unless, oh

blessed alternative! the nation by the grace and help of God awakes from its deadly dream and breaks down her idols, unless the Church reforms and revives, unless the man repents and reseeks the Cross and the salvation purchased thereon by the Saviour of sinners. The chapter we have read together this morning brings before us vividly one of these great turning points in the history of Israel, and though the occurrences figured on the scene many centuries ago, yet are they registered on the sacred page for our admonition and advantage on whom the ends of the world are come. Let us pray, therefore, that God's Spirit may bless to us the lessons taught herein to our temporal and eternal welfare!

I. God at this period had a controversy with Israel, and why? In days of old He had called Abraham, their forefather, from his country and kindred, and brought him into a land flowing with milk and honey, the glory of all lands, and promised to give its wide plains and fertile valleys to his seed for ever. In after years God fulfilled these promises, and broke the yoke of Israel's bondage and brought them out of Egypt with a mighty hand and stretched-out arm. He severed the sea before their face, and planted their feet in safety on the strand of the wilderness; all throngh the desert land He fed them with manna from above, and opened the fountain and the flood from the flinty rock. His everlasting arms never failed them in the hour of weakness, and the pillar of His Presence directed the mazes of their march, till at length the time was come, the promise ripe, and then the Jordan opened her bosom and walled up her waters on the right hand and on the left, and the redeemed of the Lord passed through the unaccustomed gates, and went up each to his inheritance to possess seven nations greater and mightier than they, their houses and their orchards, their cornfields and their cattle, and all the wealth and substance of the heathen.

And what service were the children of Israel to render unto the Lord, what gratitude to manifest for these so great and inestimable benefits, but to remember the first and great Commandment—"I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other gods but Me." Yet although all their blessings came from God, though He was the source and fountain of all their wealth and greatness, they constantly turned aside after the idols of the heathen of which the Lord had said that they should not take their names upon their lips. Among these deities Baalim and Ashtaroth were from time to time the popular objects of Israelitish worship; thus in Numbers xxv. we read that Israel joined himself to Baal-peor, and the anger of the Lord was kindled against the apostates; and again, in Judges ii., that immediately after the death of Joshua the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim; and we find Samuel (1 Samuel vii. 4) exhorting the people to return to the Lord and put away the Ashtaroths, and that they listened and put away the Baals and Ashtaroths, and served the Lord only. But this form of idolatry rose to its greatest height when Ahab the weak and wicked King of Israel united himself in marriage with Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, King of Tyre and Zidon, who had been high-priest of Baal, but murdered his brother and usurped his kingdom. This imperious woman insisted that the religion of her family and people should be established as the court-religion of the nation to which she had become allied by marriage, and so the Lord was forsaken and renounced, and Baal was worshipped in the palace of Samaria and Ashtaroth in the high places of rank and power, and the priests of the former were four hundred and fifty and those of the latter four hundred who feasted daily at the table of the Queen, their patroness.

The sin of Israel was now come to the full, and the judgment of God was ripe for execution. As when the earth is in a state of negative electricity, and the clouds that pile up their threatening forms are charged with the positive, it is then the wild storm arises, and the arrows of heaven fly abroad, so a nation after condensing its sinful practices, and hardening itself in wickedness, attracts the shafts of vengeance from above, so the flash of wrath descends to scathe and scatter the ungodly. Thus it was that a famine was sent as the minister of wrath, to lay bare and wither the fields of Israel. For three years and a-half there was no sowing nor harvest, the earth widened her chinks, which, like a myriad of parched mouths, gaped and thirsted in vain for the showers of heaven, and the cry went up throughout the length and breadth of the stricken, starving land for bread. Judgment had done its work, and the Lord remembered mercy and pitied his people. But, mark, before his favour could be shown, before the clouds could pour out their treasures, before plenty could smile upon their fruitful plains, the people must return, the tears of penitence must be shed, the idolatry must be renounced, and the hearts of Israel be turned to the Lord their God, then the Father of mercies would remember His covenant, and be gracious to His inheritance. To this end Elijah, the Nazarite prophet, arose in demonstration of the Spirit, and with power to turn the hearts of the people back again unto the God of their fathers.

(2.) In order to understand this miracle, it will be necessary to enquire what was this worship of Baal and Ashtaroth. The names of these deities are found both in the singular and plural forms; in the former the sun and moon are evidently intended, in the latter the more brilliant and noticeable of the heavenly bodies in connection with them; this worship of the lights of heaven, a fire worship, was wide spread over the whole ancient world, and the sun and moon were viewed

especially as the centres and symbols of fire. With this key we shall be able to understand the features of the controversy between Elijah and the priests of Baal—the great prophet bids the idolaters build an altar, to cleave and lay wood upon it, and slay a bullock and cut the carcase in pieces and place the offering before their God, but to put no fire under. Then he challenged the priests of Baal, the sun-idol, and said, "Let the controversy be settled, let the decision now be made, the God that answers the prayers of his people by fire, let him be acknowledged as the true God." The followers of Baal, believing their god to be the god that presided over fire, raise an universal acclaim of assent, feeling sure in their own minds of the result; "it is well spoken," the word is good! The sun was climbing the great ladder of the sky and the priests watched the blazing orb as he rolled upward in his glory, and they pray and cry to him to send down the fire on the sacrifice, but there is no answer; the noontide is come, the height of heaven is reached, now surely in the fulness of his power, the ray of fire will be kindled and fall, but no, the sun turns towards the declining path, deaf to their entreaties; they shriek, they leap upon the altar, they gash their flesh with knives to excite the pity of their god, but there is no voice, nor any that regarded, no flash descends, no spark ignites the fuel on their altar; and now the first stage of the waning day is reached, it is the hallowed hour of the evening sacrifice among the people of God. It was then when dark despair was settling down upon the hearts of the idolaters, and their mingled groans and prayers were dying away in disappointment, that the voice of Elijah rose loud and clear above the crowds, "Come near unto me." Alone and single handed he repairs the altar of Jehovah that was broken down and abandoned, he piled on it the blocks of wood, he slew a bullock and severed its limbs and arranged the sacrifice in order, but put no fire under; then round its base he dug a trench and bade the bystanders fill four vessels with water and repeat the process three times, till wood and altar were saturated and the trench overflowed. This water, some tell us, was drawn from a spring upon the height of Carmel that failed not in the time of drought, whilst others, perhaps with greater probability, think that it was brought from the Mediterranean Sea over which the mountain looked. By this operation all suspicion of collusion was banished; then at the solemn hour of sacrifice the prophet appeals to God in the words of our text: "O Jehovah, God of Abraham, Isaac and of Israel, let it be known this day that Thou art God in Israel and that I am Thy servant, and that I have done all these things at Thy word; Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that Thou art the Lord God, and that Thou hast turned their heart back again." Then the heavens opened and the glory of the Lord burst forth in living flame, the blaze of light that marched before their forefathers in the pillar, the Shechinah, the glory tokens, the epiphany of power, the burning star of the divine presence descended like a hot thunder bolt upon the altar, the fire of the Lord fell and consumed the sacrifice, the wood, and stones, and dust, and licked up the water that filled the trench, and the crowds that stood around, the deluded dupes of Baal, staggered and awe-stricken at the miracle, made confession of the creed, "Jehovah, he is the God, Jehovah, he is the God!" The days of drought, the years of famine are at an end, the Lord hath visited his people; Elijah retires to the mountain top and casts himself upon the ground and put his face between his knees in prayer, and so great was his faith, for it was energised by the Spirit, that he felt sure that his cry had entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth, and that God who had answered by fire, would also answer by rain upon his inheritance when it was weary, and so he bade his servant go and watch toward the sea; seven times he went and came, and at last reported the rising of a little cloud, like a man's hand, coming up from the waters of the deep; the token, so small, was pregnant with vast treasures of blessing, for soon the heaven was black with clouds and there was the sound of abundance of rain, and the longing earth opened her bosom and drank deep of the quickening flood, and yielded her fruit again, and plenty and prosperity made the land to laugh for joy, and the voice of thanksgiving resounded through her borders, for the thirsty drank and the hungry were satisfied.

II. In the second place, remember that the same God is the Ruler of creation now as He was then, as then so now. "In Him we live and move and have our being." It is He that still rides upon the heavens for our help and guides the clouds as His chariots, and sendeth forth the lightnings with His rain, or He bridles the storm and restrains the outburst of elemental strife; we have not suffered like the people of Israel at the period of our text, for three years and a-half from the miseries of drought, but we have been sorely tried with excessive rain and storms and floods and tempest, so that harvests have failed and our supplies have been sought from the fields and stores of foreign lands. The prayer we have just offered according to the directions of the Archbishop and the Bishop of the diocese reminds us that the present condition and future prospects of our crops are in a critical state, plenty and want, prosperity and poverty are trembling in the balance. Many have been looking forward to this year and its harvest as a turning-point in the long course of agricultural disaster; but, alas! though the yield has been infinitely superior to the produce of late years, yet we see the golden grain discoloured, sprouted, mildewed, perishing before our eyes—

oh! brethren, let us not deceive ourselves, God had a controversy with Israel, and God has a controversy with us—then in drought and famine, now in flood and famine. Let us glance at our position. Our islands have a climate, if not the fairest and sunniest, yet of a temperature which is better fitted for sustained labour than most countries. Beneath our soil are stored the best minerals in the world; our iron and coal, the two great necessaries in manufactures, are unrivalled; our race is the most enduring; our wealth far exceeds all other nations, and our colonies are in every quarter of the world; yet if we look at home and abroad, what meets the eye, what grates on the ear, what saddens the heart? At home discontent, disorder, riot, and systematic murder, trade crippled, manufactures deteriorated, harvests failing, everyone complaining, no department prospering, no one satisfied, no one hopeful. If we look abroad, we see in our colonies disaffection, dissension; no victory of late has crowned us with the laurel, but many a sore, sad tale of sorrow comes to our ears, telling of mistakes and mismanagement, of decimated armies and defeat, all alike bearing witness that we are going down in the scale of nations, in other words that the glory is departed, and that God is rebuking us. What then should we do? We must put down our Baals—our national infidelity, which is spreading like a gangrene over all classes. God will not be thrust out of his own creation. He is teaching us the lesson of this scene on Carmel. The most popular school of late, one that claims for itself high patronage, has set up the Baal of science as opposed to faith. Man is to be to himself a god. Let then the priesthood of these self-exalting sceptics be gathered together at this crisis, let them cry to their scientific discoveries, their laboratories, their ingenious mechanical contrivancies, O Baal, hear us. But will their deity hear them? Can they give us a fine day, can they sweep away the clouds from the firmament, can they stay the bottles of heaven, can they let loose the sunshine from its prison upon the sodden fields and mildewed grain? They may cry, "but there is no voice nor any that regardeth." We must suppress our national vices, which degrade and ruin the youth and maturity of our population; we must arrest the progress of the blood-stained hand that has made the sister island a proverb and a hissing among the nations, and we must guard ourselves against the dangerous contagion, for crime, which is the outcome of the corrupt heart, is catching, like the disease that bursts out from within, and festers and scars the skin with sores. These Baals must be destroyed out of our Israel.

(2.) And our repentance must not only be of a negative character, we must not only renounce our Baals, but turn our hearts also unto the Lord our God, we must believe in, and confess God as our Father, the source and giver of all blessings, both spiritual and temporal. We must acknowledge Him in that tender relation revealed in those touching words "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life." We must put our faith in Jesus Christ the crucified, Who died as an atoning sacrifice for our sins, and made satisfaction for our souls. We must confess Him risen and exalted as reigning and coming for us in glory. We must seek to be led by the Holy Spirit, the guide and teacher of the Church of God; must submit ourselves to His monitions, listen to His heavenly whispers, and rejoice in His holy comfort, and in true repentance, faith, and purpose, return unto the Lord our God; then will the fire of heaven, the Pentecostal fire fall on us, and consecrate us, our bodies and souls as a sacrifice to God; then will the latter rain of divine blessing enrich and fertilize the Church of God. Then will the desert blossom as the rose, and our waste places be transformed into the paradise of God.

But we must not forget, that as armies are composed of units, as bodies of atoms, so nations and Churches are made up of individual citizens and members. If any general reformation is to be made, it must begin with the individual. Let us ask ourselves whether we have, each of us, gone to the Cross for pardon, and had recourse to prayer for God's Holy Spirit for sanctification and grace, whether we are the salt of the earth, savouring the mass, that would else be wholly corrupt, whether our lives, our efforts, our purposes, and plans are all so directed that we may expect blessings and not curses to be the result to ourselves and those around us—in a word, are we on the side of Elijah or the priests of Baal, helpers of good, or abettors of evil. Brethren, if we are believing and living under the direction of God's Spirit, we are daily averting judgments from our land, and bringing down blessings upon it; but if we are walking in opposition to His will and pleasure, we may gaze upon the blighted crops and see the signature of our own sin, and upon the barren field, and behold the tokens of our guilt, for we have helped to fill the cup of vengeance and retribution, and so have been enemies, not only to ourselves, but to our fellow creatures also. "Cease then to do evil, and learn to do well." Flee to the Cross for pardon and peace, pray for an outpouring of the Spirit into your hearts, and turn unto the Lord your God, and He will turn unto you in loving kindness and tender mercies which shall never fail.

The Bishop of London has placed himself in communication with workhouse chaplains in his diocese for the purpose of ascertaining whether children born in the institutions, or admitted there before baptism, remained unbaptised while there, his lordship fearing that they do in many cases. In the Uxbridge Union Workhouse all such children are baptised.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1881.

THE two vacant canonries have been filled up—that at Rochester on the nomination by the Lord Chancellor of the Rev. Henry William Burrows, B.D., vicar of Edmonton, and for twenty-seven years of Christ Church, Albany-street, in succession to Mr. Dodsworth. It is the fitting reward of long and faithful services to the Church in the metropolis without adequate remuneration. To the canonry vacated at Worcester the Premier has nominated the Rev. William John Knox-Little, of St. Alban's, Manchester, of considerable reputation as a preacher at Mission services. Mr. Burrows was formerly Fellow of St. John's, Oxford, having taken his degree in 1837, First Class Classics, Second Class Mathematics. His first curacy was at Rawmarsh, then Brighstone, Isle of Wight, and next Alverstoke. He was minister of Archbishop Tenison's Chapel, Regent-street, 1848-51, previous to going to Christ Church, St. Pancras. Mr. Knox-Little graduated B.A. at Trinity College, Cambridge, Third Class Classics in 1862, and was also curate at Archbishop Tenison's Chapel, now St. Thomas's, Regent-street, 1874-5. He has been assistant-master at Lancaster and Sherborne Schools, and was appointed by Dean Cowie to St. Alban's, Manchester, with a population of 11,000 and a net income of £150 in 1875.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SERMON WRITING.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—There is another passage in the first volume of Harriet Martineau's Autobiography which I should like to point out for the benefit of beginners in sermon writing :—"Enormous loss of strength, energy, and time is occasioned by the way in which people go to work in literature, as if its labours were in all respects different from any other kind of toil. I am confident that intellectual industry and intellectual punctuality are as practicable as industry and punctuality in any other direction. I have seen vast misery of conscience and temper arise from the irresolution and delay caused by waiting for congenial moods, favourable circumstances, and so forth. I can speak, after long experience, without any doubt on this matter. I have suffered, like other writers, from indolence, irresolution, distaste to my work, absence of 'inspiration,' and all that; but I have also found that sitting down, however reluctantly, with the pen in my hand, I have never worked for one quarter of an hour without finding myself in full train; so that all the quarter-hours, arguings, doubtings, and hesitation as to whether I should work or not, which I gave way to in my inexperience, I now regard as so much waste, not only of time, but, far worse, of energy. When once experience had taught me that I could work when I chose, and within a quarter of an hour of my determining to do so, I was relieved, in a great measure, from those embarrassments and depressions which I see afflicting many an author who waits for a mood instead of summoning it, and is the sport, instead of the master, of his own impressions and ideas. As for my hours, it has always been my practice to devote my best strength to my work; and the morning hours have therefore been sacred to it from the beginning. I really do not know what it is to take anything but the pen in hand the first thing after breakfast, except, of course, in travelling. I never pass a day without writing; and the writing is always done in the morning. In London, I boiled my coffee at seven or half-past, and went to work immediately." J. R. S. C.

August 29, 1881.

THE REVISED VERSION.—THE DENARIUS.

SIR,—Many of your readers have doubtless observed that the value of the *denarius* in the Revised Version is set down as 8½d. in place of 7½d. as in the margin of the Authorised Version. I would be glad to know upon what grounds this very slight change was made, as several considerations seem to point to the conclusion that the *denarius* was equivalent to 2s. or more of our money.

1. In the Bibles printed in 1651, and possibly before that, the value is set down at 7½d. Some of your readers will doubtless be able to set me right if I am wrong in thinking that in 1651 7½d. represented at least one, possibly two days' wages of an ordinary labourer; in which case the *denarius* should be set down as equal to one or two days' wages of a labourer at present—either 2s. or 4s.

2. The Parable of the Vineyard, Matt. xx., seems to furnish grounds for thinking the rate of hire to be a *denarius* per day. If, however, the *denarius* represented two days' hire, this would only serve to bring out more strikingly the liberal and generous mind of the husbandman.

3. Who can read the Parable of the Good Samaritan without feeling a strange incongruity between the desire to express great kindness and the giving 17d. to an innkeeper that he might take care of the ill-used man? This parable, in my opinion, shews that to our Lord's mind the *denarius* must have represented much more than 8½d. of our money.

It would, I conceive, have been better to put in the Revised Version the word *denarius*, than to suggest the first incorrect idea that it equalled a penny, and then to correct that by saying, in the margin, it was 8½d., which correction itself appears most imperfect, if my reasoning be correct. Might it not have been more truly rendered a florin?

RICHARD GALBRAITH.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

SIR,—I understand from your leader of the 20th ultimo that there are some points of agreement between us. This at least—That there is a necessity for reform, especially with regard to the suppression of syphilitic marriages. I do not see, however, why the moral aspects of the case should in the main be ignored. A false principle can never be productive of the general good. Like all truths in moral and physical phenomena, the facts confirm this the more

closely and fairly they are investigated. The immediate results are often at first sight deceptive, but it is the larger and more permanent with which we have to do. Surely we can "stem the tide of immorality" by directing the law *against* it, as against many breaches of the common law, which were permitted in the more primitive ages of civilization. It has been proved that the Contagious Diseases Acts abroad have encouraged immorality amongst men, did not common sense recognise the fact that unpunished vice will be followed more than that which is punishable—a law which applies to all crime. Vice is *not* a necessity; to act as if it was is simply to surrender arms; to encourage it, is seriously to affect the public health in two ways—now, by the public custom of vicious indulgence; afterwards, by inherent weakness, its consequence. Instead of advising inactivity and inviting disease, I suggested more extensive and preventative measures; nor need they be impossible if demanded by those who support the Acts that at present exist; besides which, many that are now opponents would then join. "Doing evil that good may come," may be ascribed to those who maintain that a degrading physical law is a moral benefit, because it allows "as much vice as is compatible without punishment." Increasing endeavour towards sweeping away prostitution would do more to benefit society, morally and physically, than any regulation of vice on scientific principles. There is something ludicrous in the advocates of such a scheme bemoaning the existence of disease, and imputing the promoting of it to those that strictly enjoin morality—a disease which it is their whole aim and object to destroy, not only by moral persuasion, but by the enaction of laws against vice, of a legal penalty on those who through evil-doing contract the *fatal malady*, and the prohibition of such affected persons from marrying. Such measures would in no way further physical disease, and thereby moral degeneration. It is open to grave doubts that the Contagious Diseases Acts are as beneficial as was at first supposed; in different places they have proved a failure. Dress the fact in whatever garb you will, by the present law vice is sanctioned, and houses of ill-resort permitted. True, as one of your correspondents says, "vice is one thing, disease another;" but in this case they are inseparably connected, vice being the parent of disease, and promiscuous intercourse the chief means of producing it.

Men can outrage the closest domestic relations, and spread a ghastly disease *whenever* they please, with impunity. To quote again from your correspondent, —"It is impossible to calculate the extent of its ravages," and if it is true that one impure woman may infect *hundreds of men*, when these men marry and have children, the hundreds are multiplied by *thousands*. Our nation is for the most part *peopled* by children born in *wedlock*, but the girl-bride is, as a rule, exempt from the insidious pestilence; she enters unsuspectingly into the marriage state; she has no safeguard against the blight falling on her, and necessarily on her offspring, and thus the fatal poison is spread *through the whole nation*.

True, the abandoned practise a "specially dangerous trade for gain." Men practise a far more dangerous one for the sake of vicious indulgence; more dangerous because it not only is the means of infecting the "trading women," but the innocent who come in contact with themselves. Anyone who says that numbers of a certain class of women are not sometimes driven by poverty into disgrace, must be extremely ignorant of the history of many of them. It is true that some women are utterly depraved and false to their early teaching, but there are others who are the creatures of circumstances, who have had the worst training from infancy, who, perhaps, have never heard so much as the expression of a pure thought, and through ignorance have come to their fallen state; some of them, perchance, dancing girls, whom it is the fashion to bring forward on the boards of London theatres. If their nobler instincts ever prompt them to change their mode of life, hunger and rags stare them in the face. It may be a question of life and death with them in an overcrowded city like London. The lights, the glitter, the dazzling dress, and public notice, are for them all-potent charms. But they are the slaves to men's humour, they are *born of the requirements of the time*.. Which are the most responsible? Those who *have* such requirements. From these requirements results another system, the most infamous ever practised, i.e., the entrapping of the innocent into dens of iniquity. According to the English law, it is only a misdemeanour to abduct *poor* girls under the age of sixteen, and *rich* girls under the age of twenty-one. There is something saddening beyond words in some of the details given in Miss Bewicke's letter of last week. It seems the very acme of human wrong, that the "scarlet woman" should sit in high places and fare sumptuously every day, when the poor, honest victim of another's sin is dragged down to the last degree of physical degradation and wretchedness, no redress for *her*.

I think you have shown commendable courage in introducing this discussion into your columns, and I feel sure good will in some way result from it. It is time that men should know the iron cruelty of vicious indulgence, and that the Church should "warn the unruly." The system of silence has been carried on too long, and it has proved itself barren. It has not stemmed the tide of immorality, which seems to be increasing fast. Of what use is centuries of experience, if our youth, at an age most susceptible to temptation, are kept in ignorance of the great harm and great hurtfulness of immorality? It is singularly indicative of the times in which we live that men of influence should sneer at women for taking an interest in what so closely concerns them. Is it nothing for a son to violate all feelings of chastity, the early lessons of his childhood, the tender watchfulness of a mother? Is it nothing for a father to see his dearest child, brought up in health and innocence, the victim of a husband's sin? Is it nothing for a father to bring the direst of ills on his offspring? The closest and holiest ties are poisoned by this evil; wife and mother, which should be names full of hope and joy, are often freighted with the darkest of life's tragedies, not the less awful because enveloped in the night of silence.

It seems rather late in the day, after ages of degradation, pain, and innumerable dead, that men should at last see, even from the motive of self-preservation, that prostitution is a great, ugly blunder, a huge parasite that poisons the nation to its core. Let us hope that now, at last, at "eventide there shall be light." It is for women pre-eminently to wage war against this great Apollyon. They must bravely buckle on their armour, and fight for all they hold dear. They must gaze resolutely into the depths of those horrors, and unflinchingly face the worst if they would really help in the looked-for awakening.

Surely the enormity of the wrong, and the justice of the claim, must appeal to men of this "enlightened age."

AN IRISHWOMAN.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE CHURCH'S WORK AND WANTS AT THE PRESENT TIME." A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Maidstone, in May, 1881, by Benjamin Harrison, M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone. London: Rivingtons. 1881. Pp. 80.

The modern custom of Archdeacons to deliver annually to the clergy of their archdeaconries elaborate addresses, which are afterwards published as pamphlets, on current ecclesiastical questions, if not altogether pertinent to the proper functions of their office, may at least be accepted as a harmless and not unnatural development of it. Probably from their own point of view their relation to their archdeaconries sufficiently resembles that of the Bishop to the whole diocese, to make it reasonable that they should from their chairs of office endeavour to instruct and guide the part committed to their jurisdiction, as he from his central seat instructs and guides the whole; and for the public it is not unprofitable to learn what busy and experienced ecclesiastics have to say about the many intricate questions of Church polity, which in our restless times are continually emerging for discussion and decision. We should not like, indeed, to commit ourselves to the assertion that archidiaconal charges are invariably interesting or useful; but at any rate not a few of them have been such that we should have been sorry to miss them, and the value of these may well make us bear patiently with the rest.

Whatever pleasure may be experienced in the perusal of the Charge now before us must be due to its substance, rather than to the style in which it is written. It has none of the charm which is conferred by animated declamation, or by neatness and felicity of expression; on the contrary, the sentences are often clumsy and overweighted with superfluous words, and sometimes are even incorrect in construction. To justify this criticism a single specimen will suffice. The Archdeacon, referring to the Royal Commission on the Ecclesiastical Courts, writes as follows:— "Doubts have been expressed in some quarters, whether the terms in which the object of the Commission is worded are not so limited that it would [will?] produce simply a Report of the constitution and past history of the Courts of Judicature concerned, without any requirement as to the suggestion of alteration, if need be, to be recommended by the Commission." We doubt if it would be possible to express more awkwardly what is evidently meant by the last clause of this sentence. Nor does the passage improve as it proceeds, but rather grows worse; for whereas the Archdeacon obviously intends to express the strongest doubt that the Commission will act in a certain fatuous way, he states exactly the opposite view, and dismisses all doubt that it will do so! "But I think," he says, "it must be regarded as a doubt unworthy to be entertained, whether a Commission, applied for and granted as this has been, in consequence of the serious difficulties and embarrassments which have arisen as matters of fact, would for a moment think of stopping short of any recommendations which might commend themselves to the Commission, &c." Truly the Commissioners have less reason to be thankful for what is actually said about them than for the intention which struggled thus abortively for utterance!

Form and style, however, are but secondary matters, and much grammatical unsoundness may be pardoned if only the substance be solid and wise. And indeed of the Archdeacon's moderate and cautious tone we have no reason to complain. His chief subject was imperatively prescribed for him by the present distress; and accordingly, as soon as he has disposed of local topics, and characteristically insisted on the great importance of the regular attendance of the Churchwardens at his Visitations, he addresses himself to the burning question of Ritual. Here his chief points are two: the immense value of the reference to the Bishop's discretion, as ordered in the preface to the Prayer-book; and the danger of the Court of Arches becoming purely secular in its authority and jurisdiction. As to the former, he forcibly points out that the order really covers all the matters in debate, inasmuch as it "provides not only for 'parties that *doubt*,' but also for those that '*diversely take* anything.'" The practical difficulties, however, which surround this method of settling disputes are overlooked by him, and they are not inconsiderable. The authority of the Bishops is weakened both by their differences among themselves, and also by the mode of their appointment. Why, it is asked, should a priest blindly submit to the direction of a State-made Bishop, who may be much less qualified than himself to judge of the matters in dispute? And why should he surrender, at the arbitrary dictates of the Bishop who happens to be set over him, what in a neighbouring diocese is allowed or even enjoined? Till the Episcopate is of one mind, and expresses the voice of the Church more directly than it does at present, we fear that the obligation of canonical obedience to the Bishop will be found practically insufficient in most of the cases in which restraint of excessive ritual is most needed.

In regard to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Arches Court, no real difficulty seems to arise except in the extreme case of the two Archbishops being unable to agree in the appointment of the Judge; in which case, after an interval of six months, the Crown appoints. So long as the two Primates select the Judge, and delegate their spiritual powers to him, the Court must surely be the Church's Court, whatever additional powers are granted, or new modes of procedure are created, by the legislature of the State. And although the law contemplates and provides for the failure of the heads of the Church to appoint, it is surely inconceivable that any possible Archbishops should carry their differences to such a suicidal extreme as to allow the administration of ecclesiastical discipline to fall into the hands of a mere nominee of the Crown, to whom they refused to convey any particle of the spiritual authority inherent in their office.

A meeting of the Terrington (King's Lynn) Church Restoration Committee was held on 11th August, 1881, Rev. M. Crosse, vicar, in the chair, when it was proposed and carried that the Rev. Professor Swainson, D.D., the rector, the Ven. Archdeacon Perowne, Rev. J. Bramhall and Mr. F. Gayford, be added to the committee. The Rev. Professor Swainson said that he had been in communication with Mr. Blomfield, the architect, who had reported

on the condition of the church five years ago. His position was a somewhat delicate one. He had charge of the chancel, which, however, had been put into perfect order by Dr. Lightfoot, at a cost of £2,300. Two funds were now in existence for carrying out the rest of the work. Canon Selwyn started one, the object of which is strictly guarded by a trust deed, which provides that the fund "may be applied exclusively for the restoration and adornment of the parish church of Terrington Saint Clement aforesaid, according to a plan and estimate approved by the trustees and by the proper Ecclesiastical authorities, but not for ordinary repairs or the repair of any extraordinary casual damage." This trust fund now amounted to nearly £1,400. This had accumulated since it was commenced by Canon Selwyn; but in his (Dr. Swainson's) opinion it need not accumulate longer, but should be used in whatever way could be agreed to by the trustees in harmony with the committee. He understood the other fund, in the hands of the committee, amounted to £464 actually paid. He (Dr. Swainson) had written to Mr. Bentinck, who answered that he would give £500, subject to certain conditions. He (Dr. Swainson) would at present promise £250 specially for the west front, but as the general fund would need strengthening in order to meet possible excess over estimated expenditure, he was willing that this £250 should be added to the fund, which would thus be raised, taking into account sums promised, to £1,514, amply sufficient to complete the more pressing parts of the work. The Rev. M. Crosse explained the sources from which the general fund in the hands of the committee was derived, and said he was desirous of seeing something done before the state of the church became worse. Dr. Seccombe concurred in the observations of the rector and the vicar, and proposed the following resolution:—"That this meeting request the trustees to undertake forthwith the restoration of the transepts in accordance with the conditions laid down in the trust deed." This and the following resolutions were carried:—"That this meeting consider that the restoration of the south aisle and clerestory should now be undertaken, the estimated cost of which is £1,271." "That the Rev. M. Crosse be requested to communicate the foregoing resolutions to the trustees, and those gentlemen and ladies who have kindly promised contributions, to inquire whether they meet with their approval, and to request them to forward their contributions as soon as may be convenient, to Messrs. Gurneys, or to Sir L. Jarvis and Co, bankers, King's Lynn, to the account of the Terrington Church Restoration Committeee." From the above it will be seen that, besides the trust fund of £1,400, which will fully suffice for the restoration of the transepts, the committee have, in hand and promised, a sum of £1,514. With this they propose to undertake the south aisle. The estimated cost of which is £1,271, and should this not be exceeded, it will leave a sum of £243 available for the west end of nave, the cost of which is put at £230. This would leave the nave and the north aisle untouched, which is in a most dilapidated condition. About £2,000 additional would complete the entire restoration.

On Thursday, the 1st inst., the living of Clyst Street, Lawrence parish, Devonshire, of a thousand acres and about a hundred and fifty inhabitants, was offered for sale at Exeter, by order of the Charity Commissioners, who had the right to the next presentation. The living is worth £280 per annum, and there is a rectory-house, while the present rector is sixty years of age. At the auction this period of next presentation was thought to be remote, for although the rector is sixty years of age, yet he is in excellent health, and his grandfather held the living until the age of ninety-three. In consequence of these facts the biddings did not pass above one thousand pounds, and as this sum did not come up to the figure at which the Commission valued the presentation, the advowson did not change hands.—*Standard.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anderson, Rev. Drummond, chaplain of the Seamen's Orphan Institution; honorary canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
Barlow, Rev. Richard, rector of St. James's, at Shaftesbury.
Bird, Rev. H. G., assistant diocesan inspector of schools for London; vicar of Yiewsley, Middlesex.
Burrowes, Rev. Edward Denies, rector of Puncknowle, Dorset.
Burrows, Rev. Henry W., prebendary of St. Paul's, and vicar of Edmonton; canon of Rochester.
Coleby, Rev. Francis, incumbent of St. Peter, Westleigh.
Carr, Rev. Walter R., vicar of Foleshill, Coventry; vicar of St. John's, Worcester.
Danson, Rev. J. Myers, incumbent of St. Mary's, Arbroath, and diocesan inspector for the diocese of Brechin; incumbent of St. Andrew's, Aberdeen.
Feilden, Rev. William Leyland, vicar of Knowsley; honorary canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
Guyon, Rev. Henry Coplestone, rector of Lamyatt.
Hodges, Rev. Alfred, vicar of Christ Church, Blacklands, Hastings.
Hughes, Rev. D. M., curate of Holy Trinity, Tewkesbury; rector of Clist Hydon, Exeter.
Johnston, Rev. Henry Francis, curate of Christ Church, Woburn-square.
Jones, Rev. Edward Rhys, rector of Limpsfield, and chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester; rural dean of Godstone.
Knox-Little, Rev. W. J., rector of St. Alban's, Cheetwood, Manchester; canon of Worcester.
Langford, Rev. Augustus William Henry, rector of Thorn Falcon.
Lloyd, Rev. William Wynn, rector of Whatley.
Massy, Rev. George Eyre, vicar of Isle Brewers.
Maunsell, Rev. Frederick Webster, rector of Symondsbury, Dorset.
Pearson, Rev. Charles Richardson Jervis, vicar of Berrow.
Stephenson, Rev. John, vicar of St. John's, Weymouth; canon of Netherbery-in-Ecclesia, in Salisbury Cathedral.
Wilkinson, Rev. Dr. John Turner, curate of St. Stephen's, Chorlton-upon-Medlock; vicar of St. Thomas's, Dixon Green, near Bolton-le-Moors.
Wrenford, Rev. Dr. E. C., curate of St. Paul's, Newport, Monmouthshire; vicar of Newnham, Gloucestershire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Evans, Rev. James Joyce, M.A., principal of the Home and Colonial Training College, at 7, St. Mark's-square, Regent's Park, on the 4th inst., aged 67.
Gepp, Rev. George Edward, rector of Limington, Somerset, formerly head master of the Grammar-school, Ashbourne, Derbyshire, and sometime fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, on the 29th August, aged 72.
Holland, Rev. Frederick Whitmore, vicar of Evesham, very suddenly, on the Niesen, Switzerland, on the 26th August, aged 44.
Lucena, Rev. Lorenzo, M.A., Spanish reader at the Taylor Institute, and hon. canon of Gibraltar, on the 24th August, aged 74.
Love, Rev. James, incumbent of Trinity Church, Fortitude Valley, Brisbane, Queensland, at the Rectory, after a few hours' illness, aged 51.
Newton, Rev. Newton, at College-road, Harrow, on the 1st inst., aged 38.
Pardoe, Rev. George, M.A., vicar of Alkham, near Dover, at Leamington, suddenly, on the 1st inst.
Rocke, Rev. Thomas James, M.A., late vicar of Littleham-cum-Exmouth for thirty-four years, at Guildford, on the 30th August.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VISITATION OF GOD.

By CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 21ST, 1881.

"Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."—ST. LUKE xix. 44.

THERE is a saying of a well-known divine quoted in the *Christian Year* which is well worth remembering. It is that Holy Scripture is like a good portrait which seems to keep its eye on you as you move about the room from the wall on which it is hung. The truth of this saying becomes clearer to us as we get older and know, on the one hand, more of human life and human nature, and, on the other, more of the true meaning of the Bible. It is a saying which, from the nature of the case, applies, with different degrees of force, to the different parts of the Bible. Many of us, it seems to me, must feel that it applies with especial fitness to the Gospel for to-day. This is one of those Gospels which will bear preaching on year after year. It is too many-sided, too full of serious meaning, ever to pall upon the spiritual taste. As year by year the passing months bring us to the Tenth Sunday after Trinity, and as we pause before this wonderful Gospel and mark the tears of Christ, and listen to His words uttered over the old Jerusalem on the eve of its doom, we cannot but perceive a larger and a larger meaning attaching to it as it is interpreted more and more fully by our increasing experience. And thus it says more to young men than it says to boys, and more to the middle-aged than to the young, and more to the old than to the middle-aged. Its deep and awful import is verified for those who think at all by the events of life and by the lessons of history, although, of course, this verification cannot add anything to its intrinsic worth, but only to our sense of it. Like those schools of scenic beauty, or those masterpieces of art in foreign lands which so many of our countrymen are now hurrying to visit, it may be for a second or a third time in their lives, this passage must be visited again and again if we are to do it any sort of justice. We feel the fascination of the picture before we can account for it to ourselves at all satisfactorily; and, as a rule, the music of our Lord's words has long, very long, been treasured in memory before we begin to appreciate their bearing on the life of man.

"Thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." They are the closing words of Christ's lament over Jerusalem. As He is on His way from Bethany He crossed the Mount of Olives, and began to descend towards the valley of the Kidron, the city came into view. He did not speak at once; it was only when He had come near—that is, had descended a slight declivity, and then had mounted an intervening ridge, which for the moment had hidden the city from His eyes—that He paused, as if to rest, on what travellers have described as a ledge of smooth rock. Thus He beheld the city, allowing His eye to rest upon it with deliberation, first on one and then on another of its sacred sights, reviewing, no doubt, by the rapid but perfect glance of His mind the whole course of its eventful history. And then He wept over it—not by an impulse of uncontrollable feeling, but because He willed to do it. He wept by an action as deliberate as that by which He beheld the city lying out before Him. And then at last He spoke, and the point of His words, and, therefore, no doubt, the cause of His tears was not so much—mark this—not so much the coming destruction of Jerusalem as the reason for its destruction; not the ruin and collapse of the great temple, but that which had rendered it inevitable; "Thou knewest not," He said, "the time of thy visitation." Read over our Lord's words, and you will see that this is the governing thought in them. Twice He refers to the ignorance of the visitation of the things that belonged to Jerusalem's peace, and this, the cause of the coming doom, introduces and closes the sentences in which the doom is itself described.

First comes the expression of sorrow: "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes." And then follows the prediction of a three-fold woe, "For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another." And why? The reason which follows contains the substance of the opening words, "Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." What was the event which is here described? A visitation, my brethren, is, properly speaking, an "over-looking"; that is the strict meaning of the original word. It is thus used to describe the office of the Apostle in the Acts of the Apostles, and the actions of a bishop in St. Paul's first epistle to Timothy, and from this employment of the word in Scripture it has come to be applied to the court, for such it is, which from time to time a bishop is bound by the old law of the Church to hold in order to review the state of his diocese. But this word is more commonly applied in the Bible to God's activity than to man's, and the visitation of God is sometimes

penal, sometimes judicial, and sometimes it is a season of grace and mercy. The day of visitation of which St. Peter speaks, in which the heathen shall glorify God for His good works, is, we cannot doubt, the Day of Judgment; and Job uses the Hebrew equivalent to describe the heavy trials which had been sent to test his patience. In the language of Scripture God visits man in grace and mercy, as He did the Israelites in Egypt after Joseph's death, as He visited Sarah in one generation, and Hannah in another, as He visited His flock to use Zechariah's expression, in Babylon. It was such a visitation as this that our Lord had in view. He Himself had made it, and when He spoke it was not yet concluded. This aspect of His incarnation, of His coming down from heaven as a Divine visitation to Israel, had been celebrated in prophecy. "After many days thou shalt be visited"—so ran the promise in Ezekiel. "The Lord whom you seek shall suddenly come to His temple"—so sang Haggai; and when Christ was born the *Benedictus* arose round His cradle, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people, through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us." And the popular voice, at one time at any rate, echoed these words of the Temple poet—"A great prophet is risen up among us, and that God hath visited His people." Yes, Israel had been visited, and Christ was the Visitor. He passed Israel in review before Him; He visited each class of the population; all the departments and energies of the national life, the actual rulers of the land—Herod, and Pilate, the Roman centurion, and the farmer of the Roman taxes; the great religious teachers and Rabbis, the priesthood, its chiefs and subordinates; the lawyers and scribes who played so great a part in the later life of Israel; the religious sects, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the political religionists, the Herodians—these one after another He passed before Him. Nor was His inspection confined to the well-to-do or the influential. He spent most of His time and His efforts among the common people in their towns and in their villages, in their houses and in their occupations, in their joys and in their sorrows, at a wedding feast in Cana, or by the funeral bier at Nain. He was constantly among them, holding His court, as it were, and giving them opportunities of doing Him homage; it was a visitation for all Israel, but especially it was a visitation for Jerusalem—Jerusalem, the place chosen of God to put His name there; Jerusalem, the city of David; Jerusalem, the seat and the centre of the ancient covenanted worship challenged the inspection of His just and merciful eye as did no other place in Palestine; and its streets, its palaces, its schools of law and divinity, above all, its temple and its services, were successively examined. And presently all would be over; the visitation would be ended by the death of the Visitor in agony and shame; and He Himself, it is plain, already thinks of it as over, and after the manner of the ancient prophets, and of Isaiah especially, He anticipates as present a future which has not yet arrived; He treats the present moment as already of the past. He places Himself in thought in its midst, and the city is beleagured already by the legions of Titus and is hastening to its fall, and He cries, "Thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."

"Thy visitation." Let us remark two characteristics of this visitation of Jerusalem by its monarch. It was unobtrusive and it was final. The visitation of Jerusalem by Christ our Lord was unobtrusive: there was nothing of outward pageant or of royalty to greet the Son of David: there was no royal livery, no currency bearing the king's image and superscription—all these things had passed into the hands of a foreign conqueror, or in parts of the country, into the hands of princes who had the symbol of independence without its reality. There was not even the amount of circumstance of state which attends the reception of a visitor to some modern institution—a visitor who only represents the majesty of some old prerogative or some earthly throne. As Israel's true King visits Jerusalem, He always reminds us of a descendant of an ancient family returning in secret to the old home of his race: everything is for him instinct with precious memories; every stone is dear to him, while he himself is forgotten. He wanders about unnoticed, unobserved, or with only such notice as courtesy may accord to a presumed stranger. He is living amid thoughts which are altogether unshared by the men whom he meets as he moves silently and sadly among the records of the past, and he passes away from sight as he came, with his real station, and character generally unrecognised, if, indeed, he is not dismissed as an upstart with contempt and insult. So it was with Jerusalem and its Divine Master. He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. It may, indeed, be asked whether the unobtrusive character of His visit does not excuse the ignorance of Jerusalem. But, my brethren, there is ignorance and ignorance. There is the ignorance which we cannot help, which is part of our circumstances in this life, which is imposed on us by Providence, and such ignorance as this, so far as it extends, does efface responsibility. God will never hold a man accountable for knowledge which God knows to be out of his reach; but there is also ignorance, and a great deal of it, in many lives for which we are ourselves responsible, and which would not have embarrassed us now if we had made the best of our opportunities in past times; and just as a man who, being drunk, commits a street outrage is held to be responsible for the outrage which he commits without knowing what he is doing, because he is un-

doubtedly responsible for getting into this condition of brutal insensibility, so God holds us all to be accountable for an ignorance which He knows to be due to our own neglect. Now this was the case with the men of Jerusalem at that day. Had they studied their prophets earnestly and sincerely, had they refused to surrender themselves to political dreams which flattered their self-love and which coloured all their thoughts and hopes, they would have seen in Jesus of Nazareth the Divine visitor whose coming Israel had for long ages been expecting. As it was, His approach was too unobtrusive for a generation which looked forward to a visible triumph. Thus they knew not the time of their visitation. And the visitation of Jerusalem was final; it was not to be repeated. God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers of the Jewish race by the prophets, in these last days spoke unto them by His Son. Those were His last words to His chosen people, the last probation, the last opportunity; we may reverently say that there was no more after that to be done. Each prophet had contributed something which others could not; each had filled a place in the long series of visitations which no other could fill. Already Jerusalem had long since been once destroyed after a great neglected opportunity. The Book of Jeremiah which we have lately been reading in the daily lessons, is one long and pathetic commentary on the blindness and obstinacy of kings, priests, prophets, and people who preceded the Chaldean invasion, and who rendered it inevitable. And still that ruin, vast, and for the time being, utter as it was, had been followed by a reconstruction, that long and bitter exile by a return. But history will not go on for ever repeating events which contradict probability. One greater visitation awaited Jerusalem, one more utter ruin, and which was to be the last.

"Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." What is the explanation of that "because?" What is the connection as between cause and effect which it suggests? Does it mean merely that the Jews, having as a people rejected Christ, were punished by the destruction of their city and temple, but that nothing further can be said about it? That the punishment was independent of the crime, although not excessive, and that it might just as easily as not have been something else than what it was, since the punishment was inflicted from without by the Roman army, which, consisting as it did, of brave and disciplined pagans, could have no ideas about the spiritual history or responsibilities of a distant Asiatic race? No, brethren; this is not the full or the true account of the case. Here, as elsewhere, God works by laws which we may trace, and which are not generally superseded by agencies of a different character. Jerusalem's ignorance of its visitation by the King Messiah had a great deal to do, as cause with effect, with Jerusalem's ruin. What was the main cause of that ruin? It was, as has been said, that the Jews were under the influence of a false and blind prejudice and ambition. They had made up their minds that their Messiah was to be a political rather than a spiritual king: he was to make Jerusalem the centre of an empire which would hold its own against the legions of Rome; and with this overmastering prejudice in their minds the Jews could not recognise the real Messiah when He came, and the day of their visitation escaped them. Yet it was this same political phrensy of theirs which ultimately brought them into trouble with the Roman power; and if they had only understood the real meaning of their prejudices, had seen in their Messiah a spiritual monarch and had accepted Him when He came, the mind of the people would have taken, must have taken, a totally different direction, and the fatal collision with the forces of Rome would never have taken place. The subject suggests a wide range of applications: let us confine ourselves to a few and the most obvious. "Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." Our Lord's words account for the decay and ruin of nations. Nations have in all ages, as Jerusalem had of yore, their day of visitation. All seems to be going smoothly; there is peace on the frontier, there is prosperity at home; yet there is something rotten that does not meet the eye. So it was with the great empire of Rome under more than one of its later rulers; so it was with France during the earlier part of the last century, when she was swiftly moving on, as we know now, into the whirlpool of revolution. At these times some act of justice is pressed upon the national conscience by a great writer or a great minister; some moral or social reform of vital importance to the well-being of the people is advocated by an authority whose claims are beyond dispute; some measure of precaution against possible danger is recommended; some fatal prejudice, some variety of popular infatuation, leading directly on the road to ruin, is deprecated in terms which should rouse the conscience of the country. This is the day of visitation. It comes, it lasts only for a time, it is disregarded, and it passes; and then, after a time, surely comes the penalty, the popular war or the delirium of revolution, or the ostentatious collapse of all that means virtue in national life, until at last the enemy casts his bank around the doomed community, and compasses it round, and lays it even with the ground, and all is over. And on some ruin, perchance, faith guides the hand of history while she traces the words, "Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."

And our Lord's words explain, too, the decay and the fall of churches. As a whole, the Church of Christ cannot fall: our Lord Himself has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; but particular churches may fall all too

easily. Where are those seven Churches of Asia now, whose names live for ever in the pages of the Apocalypse, and to which such solemn warnings were addressed by our risen Redeemer Himself? They are, most of them, little better than a heap of ruins; what once was so fair and beautiful has long been trodden beneath the feet of the infidel. Where are now those Churches of Northern Africa which, during the first four centuries, played so great a part in the history of Christendom? They had their day of prosperity; they had their day of visitation, and were laid waste by the Vandal and the Moor. Nay, more, what was the case of the Church of Rome at the beginning of the sixteenth century? The best and saintliest minds in her knew full well that there was much that needed improvement. There was nothing to be said for such rulers as Alexander VI.; nothing for such enterprises as Tetzel's sale of indulgences; nothing for fictions which were known as fictions, but which were still treated, speaking officially, as truths. The revival of learning had disinterred from libraries the fair vision of the Church of the first Christian ages, and men could not but feel that it was in many ways unlike the Church of their own day. Had a serious effort been made and persevered in to restore this purer and nobler past, it is probable that the great disruption of Western Christendom which followed would never have taken place, or, if it had taken place, it would soon have ended. The visitation came, but they who then wielded authority never really heeded it; they played with the opportunity of reform as though it had no real justification in Scripture and in history, as though it was merely an eccentric variety of the spirit of rebellion. They hoped that it would die away, spend itself, and be forgotten; they would wait and see. And so it gathered strength; it passed beyond their control, and half of Europe forthwith broke away, or was made to break away, from the old Western Church. "Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." Have the words no application in more recent times and nearer home? It is not difficult for some of us here to recall the case of an English university which now nearly fifty years ago was the scene of the most remarkable religious movement in modern times. That movement was, I say, essentially religious; it was an effort to recall men to the full meaning of the Christian Creed, and to the devotion of the Christian life in the first ages of the Church. But it had many aspects and effects beyond this; it influenced not merely conduct, but faith, speculation, literature, and history; it threw a new light on the meaning of the Prayer-book—a new awe, I had almost dared to say—into the study of the Bible. It looked backward to ages that had passed and been forgotten; it looked forward, also, to the coming times, for it cherished warm hopes of progress and improvement. And especially it did this: it pointed out, to those who would listen and would think, that storms were in the air; that new forms of thought hostile to the faith of the Church were on their way to England; that if inevitable changes were to be made and carried through in a manner friendly to the Christian Creed, it must be by men who had firmly based their own thought and life on ancient Christianity, and to whom the Christian life and creed was a matter of the very first importance. And what happened? What was the welcome accorded to this vigorous and fruitful movement? The authorities of the place, with few exceptions, first one and then another, took up their parable against it, and requested its promoters to go elsewhere, or to tone down what they had to say to some popular standard of the moment. They were treated not as friends who could do a service, but as opponents whose words and acts could only be regarded with suspicion; they were for a long time systematically excluded from all places of usefulness and influence; they were pursued with invective, with denunciation, with ridicule, with sarcasm, and, to a certain extent, the opposition triumphed. Some of the best men of the movement wandered away to another Church, which knew how to honour and to welcome them, while over a larger number there crept the temper of indifference and lassitude, and, despairing of all that had seemed to be within reach, they returned to the old dull, lifeless spirit which had preceded the movement. And since then the old law has repeated itself; the day of visitation was neglected, and then there came the day of Jerusalem. All that the opponents of the movement themselves would have valued, or nearly all, has perished. The keen genius, the intrepid faith, the stern self-sacrifice which could hold its own against negative forms of thought, have been, at least in large measure, withdrawn; and we may shortly live to see what has been the home of the Church of Christ for a thousand years become a place of purely secular instruction which might have been founded last week by a company of shareholders.

An individual life is not less illustrative of the truth before us. We know what a man means when, speaking of his bodily health, he tells us that he has had a "warning." He means that some symptom of latent disease has shown itself, some unsuspected weakness in the system, some failure of strength which points to greater care respecting the diet, or exercise, or sleep, or work; and if no attention is paid to the "warning," we need not be doctors in order to know what sooner or later is likely to follow. And so in the moral and spiritual life God's ways of visiting us are many. There are two in particular which it is well to bear in mind. One is friendship—the influence of a powerful character granted us for a few years or less and then withdrawn. We never noticed how that friendship came about. Events led to acquaintance, acquaintance deepened into an intimacy, and then change of circumstances or of home or death put

an end to it. At the time it was difficult, so we say, to see in that anything remarkable; all was so natural, all was so commonplace; and yet, as we look back on it, we can clearly see that it was remarkable. A real influence has been withdrawn, designed, as we can now see, to enforce on us some neglected truth, to cure us of some serious fault, to make some vital difference in the direction of our life or in the ingredients of character. It has been withdrawn, and for us that day of visitation has passed, and the solemn question is, with what result?

And another such visitation is a serious illness. There are two ways of looking at an illness. We may trace it to its second or immediate cause—the infection, the blood-poisoning, the imprudence, the hereditary taint—and there stop; or we may with greater reason look up to Him who is the true Lord of all, the first cause, and who worketh all things by the counsel of His own will; and if we do this last, we must see in an illness a visitation from God. He knows what we want. He sees, it may be, that in us which will never be corrected in the days of rude health and of high spirits; He sees the insensibility to the seriousness of life, to the claims of others, to the true interests of the soul, to the unfathomable love of the Divine Redeemer; and an illness which gives time for prayer, for reflection, for resolution, is a school of discipline. An illness is to thousands of men one of the greatest blessings in life, and yet its significance may easily be missed, and then no such visitation may be vouchsafed again. Those who have never had bad health are, it has been truly said, objects of anxiety; those who have had it, and who are none the better for it, are certainly objects of the very deepest concern and compassion. There was a story told many years since of a boat which was getting near the rapids above the Falls of Niagara. The boatmen managed to reach the shore, but, disregarding the advice which was earnestly given them, they put out again into the stream, with the object of crossing to the opposite bank. The current proved too strong for them, and those who had warned them of their danger looked on with a distress which was too great for words, while the boat glided down with an ever-increasing speed to the edge of the falls. It is possible, brethren, in what concerns another life, to be in that condition, to have ignored God's last word of warning, and to be hurrying onwards, under the stress of influences which we cannot any longer resist or control, towards the awful future. Great reason is there for prayer, that at the critical turning-point of our career we may have, in our Lord's words, eyes to see and ears to hear, that we may distinguish God's visitations in life from what is ordinary in it, that we may remember that in every life, even in the most highly favoured, there is sooner or later a visitation which is the last. O Saviour of the world, who by Thy grace and precious blood hast redeemed us, save us and help us, O Lord!

WHAT BARS "THE WAY."

By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A.,
Head Master of Uppingham School.

Sermon Preached in the School Chapel.

"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me."—St. John xiv. 6.

THIS is our Blessed Lord's interpretation of His own words, to begin with, "No one cometh to the Father, but by Me." They contain that first great awful truth, that there is in the first instance an absolute bar between man and God. That awful truth, that sin is in the world, and that no sinner can see God, or come to Him. Sin, remember, not ignorance only, and doing wrong from ignorance, and punishment for wrong-doing; but sin, the love of evil, and hatred of good—sin, the corruption in the man himself—a putrefaction, as it were, of soul—which makes himself, his love, his hate, his affections, his thoughts, poisoned, and poisonous, which makes himself a kind of snake-like nature, and unfits the man utterly for a higher world; unfits him in himself, so that he and his thoughts are in themselves vile; unfits him to see glory, and greatness, and truth, so that glory, and greatness, and truth are vile and incomprehensible to him. This is sin: an inward plague, an impassable barrier between man and his false views, and God and truth. Therefore no man cometh to the Father save by "the Way," and that Way is Christ. The plain fact is, man does not love good, and do good, when he sees it and knows it—no fact more plain in the world—but sin can make the wisest, as they think themselves, the fact-men, the preachers of fact, as they pretend to be, to utterly put out of sight, out of the world, this central fact of the world. But Christ says, "I am the Way, no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me." Christ deals with sin, with the one great fact of human life, faces it in all its tremendous power, and conquers it, and cures it. The first aspect of sin is the vileness of the sinner, his utter unfitness to be with the true, or in company with either the things or the persons of higher life, his hatefulness in a higher world. The second aspect is, the meanness, and, if I may say so, the dull stupidity, the sottish self-intoxication of the sinner, his utter want of power to see true greatness, or value it. Both these bars must be done away with, or sinful man must die in his sins, and never come near truth. Both these bars are done away with in Christ. "He is the Way." First, sin unfits a man in himself for higher company. It is so in this world, if we choose to see it. Take for instance the poor product of our false civilisation, the pothouse hero

of the black country, say, with his coarseness, his ignorance, his rough vulgarity, his brutal strength, and his pride in coarseness, ignorance, rough vulgarity, and brutal strength, he is no fit companion for a Wordsworth, with all his poet's gentle power, for a Lady Duff Gordon, with her tender sweetness, for the Queen, in the graceful royalty of her palace. How much more shall the champion of base success, the low prizefighter from earth's black arena of philosophy, politics, or wealth (I say nothing of crime), be out of place in heaven; how much more shall the man that is a worm, living in earth, eating earth, as it were, clothed with earth, of the earth earthy, however great he may be on earth, be a revolting inconsistency in the great palace that is to be, an outrage to the pure high majesty of the Presence of God. How hateful he would be there; and how he would hate it. How he would hate it—that is the second point. As far as he could see it he would hate it. But God, to prevent this hatred of good, has in this world hidden His power, and does not come to us as a power at all. He would have us love truth, good that is, for its own sake, unbribed by fear or profit, so He comes to us humbly, in the humble shape of little duties, of humble good, of a choice of right. For if we cannot even on earth see or value the greatness of men, on such small heights as human greatness can mount to, without much previous training, how shall we rise without training to the sight of God? We do not see Him. We live and move in the midst of His world, with the very hairs of our head all numbered by Him; but we, we see Him not. He will not let us see Him too soon. He has so wrought that only by little and little, as we are able to bear it, does He let us see Him. God has made this world as a great oculist might make his eye-hospital, a place where light, the one glory of the universe, is purposely shut out, and only let in, room by room, as the diseased eyes of the patients in each room are able to bear it. For as utter blindness is the doom of the couched eye exposed to light, so to see good unprepared and hate it is, so far as we hate it, to be a devil. Once grasp what sin is, and the meaning of a sinful nature, and nevermore will anyone wish to rush on unredeemed, unpardoned, uncleansed, blind, in all the coarseness, ignorance, and rough brutality of a lower nature into the presence of the pure, high majesty of God, the Burning Light. "For our God is a consuming fire." Very sweet to him will be the words, "I am the Way: no one cometh unto the Father, but by Me." The Blood of Christ that cleanseth from all sin to him whose eyes can see, and whose heart can feel, is beyond all utterance a gift divine. Redemption, pardon, slavery gone; oh blessed message to the Redeemed. He who loves evil hates good, he who loves vileness hates heaven, even as a murderer hates law, justice, and the homes of good men. But the Redeemed, who are at peace with God through the Blood of the Cross, who are buried with Christ in Baptism, who have risen in His Resurrection to newness of life, who see and love God, and understand the language of immortality and heaven, the Redeemed, the Redeemed to whom Christ is "the Way," who have entered by the door of the fold, and go in and out and find pasture—for them all is changed, they are new creatures. "I am the Way." Yea, Lord, by Thee we draw near, by Thee we come to the Father, redeemed, pardoned, cleansed, clothed with righteousness, able to see good, and seeing, to love good through Thee. The man who puts this revelation on one side knows nothing of sin, even as the blind knows nothing of blindness. Utter blindness and utter sin cannot understand that there is light.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160. Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1881.

DIOCESAN CONFERENCES.

WE this week print the programmes of several Diocesan Synods which are to be held during the next three months. If these councils comprise a due proportion of the intelligent laity, we believe that their deliberations and discussions will be of eminent service to the people. We are not sure whether they might not with advantage be constituted in each Rural Deanery, if not in each parish, so as to revivify and give additional functions to the ancient vestry. For eliciting religious, historical, literary, scientific or social truth there is, we think, no method so efficacious as free discussion and exchange of views among well-informed men. There are many questions of general Church interest, such as Ritual, Ecclesiastical Courts, Patronage, Cathedral Reform, Intemperance, Immorality, Divorce, &c., which might be discussed in such a manner as to form public opinion, and to powerfully influence official and legislative action. We take it that they should, so long as the Church is established and its

bishops have official seats in the Legislature, most religiously decline any executive action or responsibility; like our Blessed Lord and the first councils of the Church, they must trust wholly and solely to *moral* persuasion. Otherwise they will arrogate the functions of the Legislature and quickly come into collision with the State, with the inevitable result of disestablishing and crippling, if not destroying, the most learned, the most useful, and the holiest Church in Christendom, whose ministers enjoy well nigh perfect freedom. Accordingly we deprecate the formation of a central body of delegates from these Diocesan Conferences. Over-organisation when there is no executive work to be done, and undue centralisation in a Church, are unmitigated evils. Their great and manifold spiritual evils were most ably and eloquently pointed out in a sermon on "Clericalism," by Canon Rawstorne, which we printed on the 20th ultimo. This sermon ought to be read and re-read by all who take part in the coming Conferences. The Bishops are the truest and ablest delegates to carry out the wise recommendations of the councils, and in our opinion far preferable to any active, fussy, and talkative gentlemen who may command the suffrages of a chance meeting.

THE OLD CATHOLIC LITURGY.

PFARRER BAUER'S SPEECH AT BADEN-BADEN OLD CATHOLIC CONGRESS, SEPTEMBER, 1880.

Translated by the Rev. T. ARCHIBALD S. WHITE, M.A., Baden-Baden.

HIGHLY HONOURED ASSEMBLY!—It is a special subject to which I ask your attention for a short time. If we pursue the general object of the public meetings which form part of the Congress, viz., to bear public witness as to what we Old Catholics are, I hold that such a testimony is urgently required to the reform of the Liturgy, which has been already begun, and is being slowly and deliberately worked out, especially with regard to the use of the German language in the Mass. A great portion of the honoured members of this Congress have heard this German Liturgy for the first time at the Service held on the occasion of this Congress, and have perhaps received the impression of a novelty. . . . . .

I can understand how it is that some "Catholics," and especially thinking Catholics, no longer attend Divine Service. The pompous parade of a Pontifical Mass, with the censer swung more than twenty times before the Bishop, with the numerous hand-kissings and obeisances offered to him, seems to tend far more to the glorification of the hierarchy and its members than to the honour of God. Its real, inner meaning is lost amid the numerous ceremonies aimed at honouring men rather than God, in the spectacle at the Altar, and the love of show on the part of a stupid, gazing crowd, in the noisy clang of a full orchestra with its flourish and blare. No one need be astonished if Catholics, and just those who desire to satisfy a religious need in visiting Divine Service, who wish to be edified in a truly Christian manner, keep away. They must perceive, that in the Roman pulpit the whole wealth of Christian ideas is reduced to two themes, the universal power of and full submission to the infallible Pope, and idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin. As if Catholicism, indeed, consisted only of these two things, a blind submission to the Papacy and a share in all its mechanism, supposed infallibly to lead to heaven—its rosaries, tonsures, and other things put in the place of the Christian spirit. No one need be seriously surprised that those who desire in their souls to lose themselves in the Eternal, the Divine, should feel themselves so repelled by the coarse materialism of the worship of the Heart of Jesus or of the heart of Mary, in the public devotional offices of Jesuitism, as not to come back again. It is easily explained, if as a matter of fact some Catholics, and certainly not the worst, kept away from Service for a long period of years reckoned up against them by the Roman Chaplains, until they found at last, in the Old Catholic Service, what they sought earlier in vain, viz., plain, apostolical simplicity and truth, and spiritual elevation.

By returning to the simplicity of the primitive Church we have restored the Service to its original sublimity, we have set aside all ceremonies which turn eye and heart away from the sacred act itself to accessories, and which tend to surround Bishop and Priest with that mysterious nimbus, by means of which he himself becomes the object of worship in the eyes of the superstitious multitude. We have allowed only the ancient, deeply significant ceremonies to remain, which, bound up as they have been with the Mass from the very first, symbolize the Sacred Mystery, and evoke that mental condition which ought to predominate. To the pulpit, too, we have given back its original importance, as a place from which shall be proclaimed the ideas which make us freemen; where, moreover, those other ideas, born of Christianity and rendered sacred by it, shall again be scattered as fruitful seeds in man's heart; the seeds of conscientiousness, responsibility, freedom of conscience, humanity, tolerance, loyalty to Emperor, Prince, and Fatherland.

This endeavour of ours to purify the Service and the administration of the Sacrament from everything which Jesuitism has introduced, with the idea of fortifying an un-Catholic system—this endeavour of ours led us on at the same time to a revision of the Roman Confessional, and to the preparation of an order of service which should restore to the mother tongue its inalienable rights in the administration of the Sacraments and the Burial Service. So at length there remained to us only the abolition of the last but most fatal bulwark of Rome, viz., the use of the Latin tongue in the Liturgical celebration of the Holy Supper, which had been forced upon all nations by Rome.

At our first Synod, in the year 1874, we carefully considered this difficult and important reform. It could only be carried out slowly and by degrees, because the Synod rightly declared that the revision of the Service books required a thorough and careful consideration. I will not detain you longer by the history of this work, which has now at last, after long waiting and effort, placed before the public a definite result. It is the Liturgy which was brought before you in yesterday's and to-day's Services, and which is limited for the present to that portion of the Mass in which Priest and congregation ought to be brought into the closest mutual relations. I may be permitted to say here, that, when for the first time I repeated at the altar in my mother tongue the Latin hymns and Latin prayers which are said aloud, I felt myself elevated and affected in my inmost soul, and was sensible that I was brought much nearer to my congregation and to the Eternal and Unending, than in my former use of the Latin language, which was certainly not strange to me, but quite familiar. You must yourselves have experienced a similar impression from this Liturgy. Were we justified in adopting it? As an answer to this question, we need only to keep to the fact, which even our Roman opponents (if they are candid) cannot gainsay—that the sympathy of the Catholic people in the (Latin) Mass is, upon the whole, only half conscious, and by no mean lively and joyous, or elevating and deeply effective. In point of fact, the matter stands thus:—

From time immemorial, the clear conception of what the Mass is and ought to be has disappeared from the lower orders of Catholics, and has been replaced to a great extent by superstitious conceptions. So it could not but finally come to pass that the act, from which the strength of life in the congregation should proceed, has been robbed of its

beauty and fervour, and has been transformed into a hindrance, even a danger, for individuals as well as for the community, so that it has become an actual barrier between Christ and His own people. But how was it possible that that could happen, and in connection with the dearest and holiest Institution of the Lord, in that which was dearer than aught else to His heart? By this means, that people have converted the Mass into an act in which the congregation, although obliged to be personally present, neither have nor can have any active or immediate spiritual share. The Priest did everything and said everything, and that in a dead language. Indeed, it might be said, that was something particularly beautiful, it was an exhibition of unity. Quite so, but the unity of a churchyard!

People may say, the Catholics have the Latin Mass in the Prayer Books translated into the German language. Of course, so they may follow at a distance behind the Priest. But they must be perfectly passive, without speaking a word, looking on, listening, engaged only in private devotion; and where once hearts beat higher in lively interchange of prayer and psalmody, now, under Papal order, a choir has usurped the rights of the congregation, and in default of a choir comes the Altar-attendant, the ten-year-old boy! This was a sad state of things. Such have those old Liturgies become for us, in which once the richest life of spirit and heart poured itself forth in the sacred celebration and was inflamed by their means!

I mentioned, just now, the old Liturgies. . . . Our forefathers received a German Service from the Irish missionaries; in the ancient land of the Suevi and Alemanni, and also in the land of the Franks, mighty German hymns resounded to the honour of God, until at length the last missionary sent out from Rome, in his endeavour to subdue the German Church by force to the Roman Bishop, did away with the German use and brought it under the yoke of the hard and fast Roman unity. But never does the destruction of national characteristics remain unavenged. The German people received a service which remained dark and strange to them, and which, disturbing and misleading them, was not edifying. The sad results soon manifested themselves. These press upon the Catholic population to the present day, like an overhanging Alp. If the service is not understood by the people, it become meaningless seeing and hearing—a dead imitation with its bad results. Boniface lived to see the sad results of his rendering the Service in a foreign language, without being conscious of the real reasons. He thought he must make the Priests responsible for it, and complained. "Once there were in Germany wooden chalices and golden Priests, now there are golden chalices and wooden Priests." He might have said, "Now we have instead of wooden chalices, wooden congregations." He made them wooden, and they have remained wooden. In course of time they have become such spiritually hard, dry stumps, that at last, without a murmur, they let themselves be sawn, split up and dragged to a funeral pile. Its smoke now forms the nimbus of Vatican idolatry, the blood-red lustre of the throne of the old heathen Cæsars. The superstition introduced into the Liturgy in modern times has acted as a torch to the funeral pile, has darkened the mind and stupefied the great mass of the people.

Besides what we have said, we must further remark that the Celebration of the Holy Communion ought to be entirely and essentially a Service for the Congregation. The Roman Liturgy itself, in the compilation of the Latin Mass, supposes the most intimate relation between Altar and congregation. This intimate connection of the members of the great family can only be effected by the use of the mother-tongue in all Liturgies. If we consider these things, I think we ought not to withhold from the mother-tongue its imperishable right any longer. With a view to the introduction of the German language in the Celebration of Divine Service, we may well appeal to that powerful word of the Apostle, who says in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (he is speaking about the Celebration of a Common Service), "If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. . . For if I pray in an unknown tongue," (as do the nuns at the present day, who read the Roman breviary in the Latin tongue without understanding it, or like our whole Catholic Latin Service), "my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also . . . Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified. I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all: yet in the Church," so the Apostle concludes, "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that *by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

We ought not to limit the Liturgical reform which we have taken in hand to the Altar alone. We must much more, as I say from inmost conviction, consider in the most comprehensive manner, all that clothes the Sacred Communion with the adornment of art, all that ought to serve to ornament the House of the Lord in order to warm the heart, which is often so empty and dry, and to draw it up to the Eternal. We need not think of paintings, for we are not in a sufficiently prosperous condition to be able to obtain, with our slender funds, master-pieces of art for our churches. The reform is limited to the imitation of Christ, in that we simply and sternly discard from the Temple the signs of the materialism which have been introduced into the Church, in so far as they have not already long ago been taken away, and we may lay to heart the purifying and fostering of that art, which has grown up in such close connection with the Liturgical Celebration of the Holy Communion, and forms an integral part of our Divine Service, I mean the purifying of the "*Musica Sacra.*"

Gentlemen, do not think slightingly of our work of reform, which is hereby most warmly commended to your hearts. What a mighty influence is to be attributed simply to the care of the German hymnology; what a powerful result the reformers attained, merely by means of the conservation and improvement of the old German hymns of the people, and by introducing them and giving them a place in the new order of Divine Service! The Catholic population, which at that time only dared to nibble at the stolen treasures of the already developed hymnology, seized with such eagerness upon the forbidden German song, and used it with such irresistible force, that Leisentritt declared, "The people are really singing themselves into the new faith;" and the guardians of the Curia ordered the Catholic Congregations to foster German music, at least for a time. That was the time of the publication of the first Catholic hymn-book. Thirty years later the matter wore a different aspect. Leisentritt began to be suspected as an heretic, when he wished to spread the German hymnology wider and wider; the Pope forbad it, and the Nuntius threatened him in the name of the Pope with excommunication if he did not take care to extirpate the desire of the people for the German language in the Service.

Now, gentlemen, shortly after our Offenburg Conference, at which the way was prepared for the introduction of the language of the country into Divine Service, our Roman opponents also held a similar Conference, at which the Catholic laity had their attention called to the numberless prohibitions issued concerning German hymnology, and were advised that real Catholicism only expressed itself in Gregorian chorales and polyphonies of the middle ages, and that diligent attention must be paid to the introduction into the congregations of the Latin Mass and Vesper Music. Messrs. Forderer and Lender may perhaps succeed in the un-German efforts of the so-called Cecilia-Guild, and be able to teach the school-children and congregations such gibberish as Latin must be to them. Leave the gentlemen to their pleasure; when once the Latin mass and Vesper music has crept into the congregation, then I think if we do our part, the time may come when the German people through the purified hymnology offered by us will again sing themselves out of the new faith just as they sang themselves into

the new faith in the time of the Reformation. It is true we must offer for that purpose other hymns than those which the present Roman Catholic Hymn Books offer. These are marred almost without exception by the coarse materialism which has been introduced by Jesuitism even into Church hymnology. Text and melody are thoroughly weakened, watered, and washed away, and scarcely even in a few instances reminds one of the strength and heartiness of German sacred music.

If you take up any hymn book, you will find that nearly all these Roman melodies of the present day are such that with an altered text they can be sung as very inspiriting drinking songs. In the new collection there are to be found only a very few of the hymns which have sprung from real German spiritual life. All others are weakened in truly Ultramontane fashion. Catholic hymnology has become trivial, even frivolous, and a reform is absolutely necessary. We cannot certainly blind our eyes to the same defect in the Protestant Church music; for if, with the exception of a few examples of the pious-sentimental kind, it did not waste its earnestness upon a vile frivolity, it would spend very much of its earnest impulse upon a zealot Puritanism. We see in their present hymn-books its original rhythmical flow banished by an unattractive monotony. It is jerky, full of passing notes, between which even the connecting tones are wanting. It has lost its original freshness. Our Protestant friends perceive this dissonance, and are earnestly considering means of relief. We must not be behind them, even if we also have to unearth this splendid Church music from beneath the rubbish of long centuries. We possess, however, in this old Church music and also in the hymnal treasury of primitive Christianity, invaluable material, which only wants sifting, in order worthily to replace the Church music that has succeeded it. In this direction the road for a new reform has been paved by the publication of a new hymn book. According to the fundamental maxim, "prove all things, hold fast that which is good," a thorough trial of it is much to be recommended.

I am sure that in what I have said I have pointed out a great Roman scandal. I look upon it as the duty of every individual to make headway against this scandal. We must show that the Sanctuary of the Lord, His Adoration and Honour are very dear to our hearts. We must take good care to purify the Sanctuary from all the impurities with which for centuries men have defiled it.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SERMON WRITING.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—The experience of Miss Martineau might be supported by that of Dr. Johnson, who was always able to write whenever he wished to do so. But I submit that this ability is not universal. If I may bring forward my own case, I should say that there are many seasons when it is simply impossible to write, because it is impossible to think; or, if compulsion be exercised, writing done without thinking will be of little use.

Perhaps it is to the habit of writing sermons to command, whether the mind is inclined that way or not—what Quakers would express in other terminology by saying, "Whether the Spirit moved them or not"—that the dulness of so many sermons, about which one hears a great deal in these times, is to be ascribed. No doubt another cause of the inefficacy of modern sermons is this, that preachers are fairly puzzled among the various currents of modern thought, and know not what to believe, and therefore what to teach. Canon Liddon's sermon in the same issue of the PULPIT bears testimony (very impressively) to this source of weakness. C. P. R.

September 12, 1881.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

SIR,—Your correspondent "E. T." is not so ignorant as is conveniently assumed by some. The question is, the trade in prostitution, its beginning, its encouragement by law; and not what is the present condition of the disgraceful traffic (allowed and regulated by law) in large towns. My position is simple, and—impregnable. No skill in words, however skilful the letters written may be, and no array of statistics, good or bad, can do away with the distinction between *punishing* a trade, and *approving it.* I say "approving it" deliberately, for when the law only interferes to stop bad trading, it approves of the trade when not pursued under bad trading conditions. The law against adulteration, for instance, approves of trade in unadulterated articles; and in like manner the law against unhealthy fornication approves of healthy fornication, when it leaves it untouched. I for one would support almost any law for punishing the sin. But I shall continue to loathe legislation that only provides that the trade shall be healthy; even if in some few instances it leads to the rescue and reform of individuals. E. T.

SIR,—Allow me also to thank you for opening your columns to the discussion of this very difficult and delicate subject, and for publishing my letters. I hope that good will come of it, and I think it has shown very clearly that if those who oppose and those who support these Acts will find out points of agreement, instead of difference, many of the latter will vanish altogether. Moreover, the asperities of those points where both would still have to agree to differ would be much softened. For instance, we are all agreed that prostitution exists, that certain diseases result from it, that it is our duty to prevent prostitution as much as possible, and where we fail to do this, to mitigate its evils to both sexes. But how to achieve this?

I am surgeon to a Voluntary Lock Hospital in a city containing upwards of one thousand prostitutes well known to the police, residing in brothels which are mostly kept by women. In our hospital are fifty beds, twenty-five for each sex. As it is the only hospital of the kind within forty miles, it might be expected that both sides would be generally full. The male wards are fairly filled all the year round; the female are frequently half-empty. The admission is free; every kindness is shown the patients; there is no difficulty in obtaining admission, and they can leave when they please. The highest number of females we have ever admitted was two hundred and ninety-one, while that of males was three hundred and ninety-one. Many of the women stay till they are cured, and as a general rule return to their old mode of life. The majority are prostitutes, with occasionally a married woman. Now it will scarcely be credited, but it is a fact, that frequent attempts have been made to close the hospital on the grounds that it encourages immorality. I know no class of persons more to be pitied than the officers of this and similar hospitals. Long before it was proper, still less fashionable, for ladies to discuss this subject, they were working silently, doing all the good they could without any

encouragement, and they receive but little now. And it will be interesting to "An Irishwoman" to know that the Westmoreland Lock Hospital in Dublin was supported for many years by a grant of £2,813, annually obtained, somewhat furtively, from the Government, until the Scotch Purists and Lambeth Economists were strong enough, first in 1838, to reduce it to £1,750, and in 1854 to overthrow it altogether. But a committee of the House of Commons, composed of eleven English and only five Irish members succeeded in 1857, in spite of Ministerial opposition in restoring the vote to its place on the list. Among other evidence adduced was the fact that *only £1 had been voluntarily subscribed to the hospital in thirty-four years.* We have passed the time when such inhuman attempts are likely to be made, since it is now the fashion to suggest voluntary lock hospitals, and free dispensaries as substitutes for the Acts. Miss Bewicke has yet to learn, what is well known to surgeons, that free dispensaries are worse than useless so far as prostitutes are concerned, simply patching them up in the morning to follow their trade in the evening. Voluntary lock hospitals have this fatal objection, that women will not enter them till they have already done an incalculable amount of mischief; they come in not because they are diseased, but because they are so diseased as to be unable to follow their calling. Again, when they are beginning to feel better they will often persist in leaving uncured, especially when any great attraction, such as a local race, bank holiday, etc, occurs. Hence the necessity for legislation. The Acts provide that women shall not ply their trade without provision being made periodically to ascertain whether or not they are diseased. If they are, then they must go to hospital till they are cured. While there every care is taken to promote their moral improvement, and when cured they can go to their friends or to a refuge free of expense to themselves. In the name of reason and common sense, I ask, what better means can be adopted to effect what is required? the reformation of prostitutes. Taken from the giddy whirl of their lives, compelled to reflect upon them, provided with skilled medical attendance, nursing, and means of grace, can we wonder that these Acts are successful, and are regarded by such clergymen as Canon Puckle, Mr. Grant, Mr. Wilkinson, and the Rev. Dr. Webster of Cork, by priests and ministers of all denominations as the most powerful means of reforming prostitutes which could be devised.

As I have some regard for your space, and know well that long letters are not so likely to be read as shorter ones, I will conclude with a quotation or two from some abler pens than mine. Sir Henry Thompson, writing in 1867, says :—"I know of one way only on which society can rely for checking the disease. It is not by hunting down the prostitute, and chasing her from one locality to another—a treatment which increases her recklessness and propagates contagion; but, on the contrary, by caring for her health, and by regulating her habits." The late Mr. Acton, writing in 1869, says :—"This word 'recognition' may sound very dreadful, and be regarded by many as the precursor of a coming deluge of continental immorality. But what is the real fact? Is not recognition already accorded by society? Who are those fair creatures, neither chaperons nor chaperoned, 'those somebodies whom nobody knows,' who elbow our wives and daughters in the parks and promenades and rendezvous of fashion? Who those painted, dressy women flaunting along the streets, and boldly accosting the passers by? Who are those miserable creatures, ill-fed, ill-clothed, uncared for, from whose misery the eye recoils, cowering under dark arches and among bye-lanes? The picture has many sides; with all of them society is more or less acquainted. Why is the State, that alone can remedy a condition of things that all deplore, alone to refuse recognition? The voluntary system has been tried long enough with its affected ignorance, and empty parade of hospitals, penitentiaries and asylums. Individual efforts are powerless to effect either the cure of disease or the reformation of the prostitute. The nation's weakness can be assisted only by the nation's strength." In 1870 he says, in answer to an opponent of the Acts, the late Rev. F. D. Maurice :—"If Mr. Maurice will believe me, we are both labourers in the same vineyard—we both desire to improve the social, moral, and sanitary condition of unfortunate women; and all I ask of him is not to neglect the fallen, while he is considering how they shall be made to cease from falling. As I have already said, the Contagious Diseases Act is only one of many measures that I desire to see in operation for checking prostitution, and the mischiefs arising from it. Surely the healing the prostitute's body, and reducing the amount of the suffering by her inflicted on the rest of the community, is no obstacle, but rather a help, to the extirpation he desires. . . If surgeons are left to deal with questions and to remove evils, the cognizance of which comes peculiarly within their province—if the ladies and the clergy and all who have at heart the well-being of the race, will deal with those evils which they can severally remedy—and if all will unite in the common cause, not magnifying their own peculiar province, nor depreciating that of others, but gaining and giving mutually all the help and strength they can, we may hope to see, not the extirpation of prostitution, for this can only come to pass when poor humanity ceases to be frail and sinful, but a considerable diminution in the number of prostitutes, and a great amelioration of their condition." These admirable words, sir, hold good now, and must be my answer to all those passages of your correspondent which I have not specially noticed.

13th September, 1881. A SURGEON.

The *Pall-Mall Gazette* having suggested that the Royal clemency could not be extended to the rector of Miles Platting because he is in a state of rebellion, Dr. W. G. F. Phillimore, Chancellor of the diocese of Lincoln, has written to the editor :—"Pardons for contempts of the ecclesiastical courts were not unfrequently granted by the Crown in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., as a perusal of Coke's and other reports of the period would show. In the various statutes of pardon passed at frequent intervals from the time of Henry VIII. to that of George II. inclusive, contempts of court, whether ecclesiastical or civil, were always included. Thorogood, the Quaker, received in 1840 not merely his discharge from prison, but a complete pardon by the means of an Act of Parliament, avowedly designed to effect this very purpose. He was as 'contumacious and in contempt' as ever when he was actually released and discharged from all further liability. The Chancery doctrine of the mode of punishing contempt of court (which differs from that of the old common law courts) is surely odious enough, without the addition of constructive treason."

The Carlisle Diocesan Conference will meet in the Fratry on the 27th and 28th inst. Among other subjects discussed will be Mr. Stanhope's Church Patronage Bill, the consideration of which will be introduced by Canon Prescott. Mr. James Cropper, M.P., will read a paper on "The Influence of the Theatre." The first Liverpool Conference will take place at St. George's Hall on the 16th and 17th of November. The Bishop proposes to invite all the beneficed and licensed clergy, and two lay delegates from each parish. It is expected that the Constitution of the Conference, Diocesan Finance, the Needs of the Diocese, the Advantages of a Cathedral, and Parochial Councils will be the subjects brought under discussion. The Bishop has appointed Mr. Thomas Comber, Canon Warr, and the Rev. J. H. D. Cochrane to act as secretaries to the conference. The Lincoln Conference will meet on Friday, the 21st of October. The subjects for consideration will be "The Revised Version of the New Testament," address by the Bishop; "The Poor Law, Benefit Societies, Labourers' Insurance, and National Thrift," paper by the Hon. M. E. G. Finch Hatton. The Peterborough Conference will be held at Northampton on the 11th and 12th of October. The programme is as follows:—First day, the Bishop's Address—Reports of Committees—Sunday Closing of Public-houses—The Organisation of Lay Help—The Question of Sending Representatives to the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences. Second day, Mr. Stanhope's Church Patronage Bill—Special Missions in Country Parishes—The Influence of the Church upon Popular Recreations. Committees to be moved for—1. On Home and Foreign Missions; 2. On the Formation of a Diocesan Board of Education; 3. On Glebe Lands and Queen Anne's Bounty. The St. Albans Conference will meet at Colchester on the 12th and 13th of October. The subjects for the first day will include motions of Archdeacon Grant on the supply of candidates for holy orders; of Mr. U. Heathcote on sale, exchange, and resignation of ecclesiastical benefices; and of the Hon. and Rev. L. Neville in favour of establishing a cheap weekly newspaper. Archdeacon Blomfield will move that three clergymen and three laymen be elected as members of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences. The Rev. John Menet will also move for a committee on the whole subject. On the second day a resolution on thrift will be moved by Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson. The revival of the Diaconate and the Parochial Boards Bill will also be considered.

The Irish Church Act Amendment Bill is one which should not be allowed to pass into law without notice. It was brought in by Mr. W. E. Forster and the Attorney and Solicitor-General for Ireland at the very fag-end of the Session, and passed rapidly through both Houses without any serious opposition whatever. The Act brings to an end the Commission to which has been committed the management and distribution of the funds derived from the Disestablished Church in Ireland. By this Act "the Corporation of the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland is dissolved." Lord Monck and Mr. Justice Lawson retire from their posts. The whole of the Church property held by the Church Temporalities Commissioners, whether in lands, money, or tithes, is transferred to the Irish Land Commission. All the powers vested by the Irish Church Act of 1867 in the Church Commissioners are transferred to the Land Commission, and upon it devolves all the duties which they were empowered to discharge. The secularisation of Irish Church property is now complete in name as well as in reality. What remains of it will henceforth be administered by a department of the Irish Land Commission, and as time goes on its former dedication to the service of Almighty God will be gradually forgotten. It cannot be denied that the Irish Cerberus has been well fed of late. A Disestablishment and Disendowment Act and two confiscating Land Acts in less than twelve years might satisfy even his rapacious appetite; but will they do more than increase his future demands? We trow not.—*The National Church.*

A dispute recently arose between the Oldham Town Council and the local clergy as to whether the latter were entitled to receive the burial fees of persons interred by Nonconformist ministers in the consecrated portions of local cemeteries. Counsel's opinion has been obtained to the effect that the clergy are entitled to receive such fees, but not the fees for burials by Nonconformists in the unconsecrated portions of the cemeteries, or the fees for interment of non-parishioners in consecrated ground.

At Ulverstone Parish Church last Sunday week, the Rev. C. W. Bardsley preached a sermon upon Sabbath observance. Alluding to the strictness of the Judaic law regarding Sabbath observance, he pointed out that what was practicable in the wilderness, where manna was rained down for the sustenance of the dwellers, was quite impossible in colder climes. When he was resident in Manchester the thought of leading hay on a Sunday would have been regarded by him as an infraction of the Sabbath; but since he came to Ulverston he had seen the matter in a different light. He had frequently been asked this summer by farmers, did he consider it a sin to get their hay secured on a Sunday? He thought the matter out, and he felt that whilst the Fourth Commandment was applicable to the dwellers in the wilderness, its strictness had been abrogated by our Saviour—"Which of you have an ox or an ass," &c. Christ performed most of His miracles on a Sunday, and the Sadducees were awfully offended. He allowed His disciples to gather and eat wheat on the Sunday, and the Sadducees were wroth. Plainly, Christ gave His sanction that works of necessity or works of mercy could be performed on the Sabbath. Putting aside the loss or profit to the farmer as to whether his hay was secured in good or bad condition, he (Mr. Bardsley) held that it was an act of mercy to secure it in good condition: mercy to the live stock that had it to eat, and so they would tell us if they could speak. He thus held that in a season of bad weather the farmer who secured his hay on a Sunday performed but a simple duty where the necessity existed.

On Monday last a meeting of the ratepayers of St. Saviour's, Southwark, was held at the board-room of the Borough Market, to consider the scheme of the Bishop of Rochester for the abolition of the compulsory church-rate. Mr. T. F. Rider, Warden of the Great Account, presided, and there was a large attendance. After some preliminary discussion, Mr. Andrew Dunn said it was only gentlemanly and proper that the Bishop's letter should be courteously considered, and the best thing to do would be to appoint a committee.—Mr. Burls: We have had it for a month now. Why not put the church up by auction and sell it to the highest bidder?—Mr. Fielding: What would you give?—Mr. Burls: More than you, or you would not let them take away your coal-scuttle instead of paying the rate.—Mr. Palmer did not see why the

committee could not be elected in the same manner as Poor-law guardians, by papers been sent out to all the ratepayers. Some time ago it was proposed to turn the grand old church into a warehouse. As far as he was concerned they might pull it down ; but let everyone have a voice in the matter. One gentleman had offered to find £5,000. Were they going to let the whole of that old structure go for a paltry sum of £5,000? Surely they knew the value of freehold property better than that.—Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Harris, moved that the Bishop's offer be rejected. —Mr. Lawson pointed out that his lordship's object was to prevent the tumult in connection with the church-rate and the election of a chaplain. For generations past their forefathers had paid the rate, when there was no sympathetic bishop. The Bishop's scheme would do away with the rate and all privileges, and would take away the keystone of all the charities in the parish. His father had paid a church-rate of one shilling in the pound ; but now that they were nearly out of debt, the Bishop kindly offered £7,000. Where that church stood Protestants were led to the stake, and it was the first place in which the note of civil and religious liberty was first struck ; therefore they ought to respect it.—Mr. Stafford thought they ought to feel proud of the Bishop for having come forward as he had. He (the speaker) was no apologist for the church, and it did not matter to him if it were pulled down to-morrow ; but he respected it for its historical associations, and because Shakespeare and his family were connected with it.—Ultimately the amendment was put and lost, and a committee to consider the offer of the Bishop to do away with the rate, and place the church under his patronage, was agreed to.

On Sunday last the Bishop of Rochester preached at the Victoria Coffee Music-Hall, New-cut. Evening services had been conducted here from the beginning of February to the end of May ; and their success, added to the probability that the hall might fall into the hands of the Secularists, induced the promoters to secure the premises for a term of three years. It is now intended to open the place on Sunday evenings all the year round throughout that period. A programme to the end of the year has been issued ; and among those who have consented to preach are Canon Farrar, the Rev. William Barker, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Dr. Norman Kerr, the Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, Mr. H. S. Wilde, barrister at-law, Canon Richardson, Mr. Sydney Gedge, Mr. F. A. Bevan, Mr. C. Tritton, the Rev. J. W. Horsley, and Mr. H. Sargant. The cause of temperance will not be overlooked, for accompanying the hymn-book handed to each person is a printed form of pledge, which, without any pressure other than occasional notice from the platform, a worshipper may fill up and hand to the steward at the close of the services. Among the supporters of the movement may be mentioned the Duke of Westminster, the Earl of Aberdeen, Lord Mount-Temple, Lord Brabazon, the Dowager Lady Wolverton, Sir John Coode, Mr. R. Foster, Mr. James Cropper, M.P., and Mr. Wilberforce Bryant. It is estimated that each service will cost £12, the rental of the building being £300 a year. Last Sunday tunes were played on the cornet outside in the open air, just before the service, to attract the notice of passers-by, if happily they might be induced to come in. Sankey's hymns were used throughout. The Bishop delivered a striking discourse on the lawyer's question to Christ, "Who is my neighbour?" The Bishop did not stand at the desk set for him, but the side of the table, and talked to his audience in a homely manner, without the use of manuscript or notes. He interrupted his discourse once for the singing of a hymn, and then resumed. The whole tone of the service was earnest and solemn, but free from wild or unhealthy excitement.

The Church of England Parochial Mission Society have appointed the Rev. J. Cullin, M.A., to conduct evangelistic work in the diocese of Rochester, on the invitation of the clergy. He will act under the general direction of the Bishop, and his duties will commence in November.

On Monday last the Dean of Lichfield laid the foundation-stone of the new Church of St. John, Aylesbury. There was a large and distinguished company present at the ceremony, including the Duke of Buckingham and the Ladies Grenville. In replying to a vote of thanks, the Duke referred to his experience in church-building in India, saying he remembered an instance in which a church was commenced building, and at the foundation-laying only a single voice was raised to sing.

Canon Butler, of Worcester, writes to the *Church Times*, *à propos* of Dean Stanley's successor :—"I am sure that you would not intentionally give a wrong report of a public man, and I venture to think that you have not—from one or other cause—formed a right estimate of my colleague, Canon Bradley, who is about to enter on the important duties of Dean of Westminster. I hope that he will not consider it an impertinence if I say that during the time in which we have lived and worked together here, I have learnt to see in him a man of really large sympathies and real generosity of heart ; and no one who knows him can doubt the deep sense of religion and love of the Church of England—however possibly some of us may disagree with his views of what is most calculated to promote her interests—which pervades his whole life. I earnestly trust that in his new sphere of work he may be received by all schools of thought in a kindly and trustful manner. I am quite certain that he will respond to it."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bligh, Hon. and Rev. Henry Vesey, late vicar of Abingdon, Berks ; vicar of St. James', New Hampton.

Ellacombe, Rev. Henry Nicholson, vicar of Bitton and rural dean of South Hawkesbury ; honorary canon of Bristol Cathedral.

Nash, Rev. Z., vicar of Christchurch, Hampshire ; chaplain to the Workhouse.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Everett, Rev. Charles Dundas, of Besselsleigh, near Abingdon, at Dorchester, Oxon, killed instantaneously by a fall from his horse, on the 7th inst.

Eyton, Rev. Robert William, formerly rector of Ryton, Salop, and author of the "Antiquities of Shropshire," &c., at Winchfield House, Hants, on the 8th inst., aged 65.

Hancock, Rev. John, vicar of Haselbury Plucknett, Somerset, on the 5th inst., aged 69.

Morshead, Rev. John Philip Anderson, of Widey Court, Devon, for twenty-seven years vicar of Salcombe Regis, at Salcombe Regis Vicarage, Sidmouth, on the 7th inst., aged 72.

Owen, Rev. Hugh Davies, D.D., J.P., late rector of Trevdraeth, Anglesey, at Beaumaris, on the 4th inst., aged 85.

Wyche, Rev. Cyrill Herbert Eyre, M.A., rector of East London, South Africa, for many years senior curate of St. Peter's, Eaton-square, drowned while crossing the Chalumna river, on the 25th July.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"HE DESCENDED INTO HELL."

By the Ven. ARCHDEACON REICHEL, D.D., Rector of Trim and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin.

Sermon Preached at Trim, on the 4th Sunday after Easter.

"Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also He went and preached to the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing."—1 Peter iii. 18, 19, 20.

IN the first rudiments of our Christian faith, comprised in the Apostles' Creed, which we are made to get by heart in early childhood, we are taught that "our Lord Jesus Christ descended into hell;" and this belief is solemnly professed by every member of the congregation when that Creed is repeated in the daily service of the Church. And it seemed of so much importance that it should be distinctly acknowledged by the Church of England, when we separated from the Roman Communion, that our Reformers thought proper to make it by itself the subject of one of the articles of religion. They were aware that upon the fact of our Lord's descent into hell the Church of Rome pretended to build her doctrine of purgatory, which they justly esteemed one of her worst corruptions; but, apprehensive lest the need for reformation might in this instance carry them too far, and induce them to reject a most important truth, because a dangerous error had been ingrafted upon it,—to prevent this intemperance of Reform, they assert in the Third Article, that, "As Christ died for us and was buried, so is it to be believed that He went down into hell." The terms in which they state this proposition, imply that Christ's descent into hell is as much to be believed as that He died upon the Cross for men: that it is just as much a fact in the history of our Lord's life and death, as the burial of His dead body. It should seem that what is thus taught among the first things which children learn, should be among the plainest: that what is laid down as a matter of the same necessity to be believed as Christ's Passion and Atonement, should be among the least disputed: that what every Christian is required to acknowledge as his own belief, in the (daily) assemblies of the faithful, should little need either explanation or proof to any who have been instructed even in the very first principles of the doctrine of Christ. But so it is, that what the sagacity of our Reformers foresaw, the precaution which they used has not prevented. The truth itself has been brought into discredit by the errors with which it has been adulterated; and such has been the industry of modern refinement, and, unfortunately, so great has been its success, that doubts have been raised about the sense of this Article of the Creed by some, while by others its truth has been denied. It will therefore be no unprofitable undertaking to shew that the assertion in the Apostles' Creed that "our Lord descended into hell" is to be taken as a plain matter of fact in the literal meaning of the terms; to shew what proof of this we have in Holy Writ; and, lastly, to shew the great use and importance of this fact as a point of Christian doctrine.

First, then, for the sense of the proposition, "He descended into hell." If we consider the words as they stand in the Creed itself, and in connexion with what precedes and follows them, they appear to state something which our Lord performed in the interval of time between His burial and His resurrection; for thus speaks the Creed concerning our Saviour: "He was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead." The descent into hell is here evidently spoken of as an action of our Lord, performed by Him after He was dead and buried, and before He rose again. In the body our Lord could perform no action during that time, more than any other dead man; for the very notion of death is, that all bodily sensation and activity is extinguished. This, therefore, was an act of that part of His human being which continued active after death—of the soul or spirit separated from the body, just as His burial must be understood of His body only separated from the soul. The dead body could no more descend into hell, than the living soul could be laid in the grave. The words, therefore, as they stand in the Creed, seem as little capable of any variety of meaning as the word "buried." And if they require any explanation, it must be only because the word "hell" in the Creed is not clearly understood.

Now there are two meanings in which the English word "hell" is used in the English Version of the Bible. And one of these meanings has become so much more frequent in common parlance, that it has almost concealed from view and eclipsed the other. The first and most proper of these meanings is, the place of departed spirits. In this meaning, and in this meaning only, is the word "hell" used in the Old Testament. As when David in the 16th Psalm declares: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." He does not mean that his soul will go into the place of torment, but will be rescued thence. Taken in this sense, the words would imply that the state of torment in the future life is one which may be terminated: a

conclusion nowhere explicitly stated in Scripture. What he means is this, that God will not leave his soul in the place of departed spirits. And thus the words are a clear anticipation of the resurrection of the body: a declaration that the separation of the body and soul is not the final state of God's redeemed, of whom the Messiah was the most illustrious, or rather, the typical example; but that the soul, delivered from that invisible world in which do live the souls disunited from the bodies they formerly animated, shall be restored to full vigour and activity, in a state analogous to that in which it now exists. And in the same sense is the word "hell" used in several passages of the New Testament, as it is invariably in the Old: as for instance, where our Lord declares that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church; thereby meaning that the invisible world shall never succeed in swallowing up and engulfing the Church He came to found; that it shall never cease to have a visible existence on earth, until He shall return to take it to Himself in heaven. Nay, even in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the word "hell" is used to translate one which in itself does not imply the existence of torment; it is the invisible world, and not the lake of eternal fire, in which our Lord declares that the rich man lifted up his eyes, being in torment. The torment was there, but it was not characteristic of the place, as it is characteristic of that place to which wicked men and evil angels shall be consigned at the Resurrection.

The other meaning in which we used the word "hell" has however almost entirely obscured that meaning which I have explained to you, and which, as I have stated, is the only meaning the word ever bears in the Old Testament. Unfortunately, when our translation of the Bible was made, the translators were not alive to the mischief that might arise from employing the same English word to convey the sense of two quite different Greek words; and hence the notion popularly entertained of hell as always denoting a place of torment has darkened, or rather quite altered, the true sense of several important passages. But when the place of torment is spoken of, the word employed in the Greek is quite different from that which denotes the invisible world, and which is used in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and in the promise of Christ to His Church, that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. The place of punishment is called Gehenna, or the Gehenna of fire, from two Hebrew words meaning the Valley of Hinnom, because in that valley the corpses of the dead were buried, and because in former days men and women and children were often burnt to death in that valley in honour of the false god Moloch. If, therefore, we wish to know in what sense the word "hell" is to be taken in any passage of the Bible, or in the Apostles' Creed, we must see what word is employed in the original language in such passage; and we can only conclude that the place of punishment is meant when the terms Gehenna, or Tophet, or the lake of fire, are used. But when the word employed is, "Hades" in Greek, or "Sheol" in Hebrew, as is the case in the passages I have quoted, then it is only the place of disembodied spirits that is meant; and any notion, whether of happiness or of misery, lies not in the words so used, but in the connexion in which that word is found.

It is likewise observable that in its original and proper sense the English word *hell* did not imply the place of punishment; for its original meaning is simply a hole, a covered-up place, a place hid away from sight. But this, its true and proper sense, has been almost forgotten from the circumstance that our translators used it not merely to express that place, the place of all disembodied spirits, but also to express the place of punishment to which the wicked are to be consigned at the general Resurrection.

We are now in a condition to understand the true meaning of our Article, and of the clause in the Apostles' Creed which it asserts. When Christ is said to have descended into hell, the meaning is simply this, that He descended into the place of disembodied spirits. That He did not go into the place of eternal torment is evident, first, from the original words of the Creed; secondly, from His own declaration to the dying thief, "This day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise;" and thirdly, from the fact that the place of eternal torment is never spoken of in Scripture as being tenanted by any beings until after the general Resurrection.

That our Saviour should go to the place of disembodied spirits was evidently necessary in order that He should completely fulfil all the conditions, and enter into all the circumstances, of our nature. For, if He had not gone into the place of disembodied spirits after His Death and before His Resurrection, there would be one scene which must be visited by all human beings who have died, but which He Himself had never visited, and His experience of our circumstances would be so far incomplete. Nor would any difficulty have been found in admitting our Lord's descent into hell had it not been for the confusion arising from the word "hell" being used in a double sense; a confusion which led people to imagine that by descending into hell it was meant that Christ actually shared for some time the torments of the damned; an idea inconsistent with every feeling of propriety, irreconcileable with His own declaration to the thief upon the cross, and incompatible with the plainly revealed fact that those torments do not commence till after the Resurrection, inasmuch as then for the first time are the wicked told to depart into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.

But this invisible world is just as little the scene of final happiness as it is the scene of final misery. The repentant thief was told by our Lord

not that he should be with Him this day in heaven, but that he should be with Him this day in Paradise. The term must have been carefully selected by our Saviour to shew the difference of that place to which He was going immediately after death, and that place or state to which He ascended after rising from the dead.

The examination of the terms used in Scripture thus leads to the following result: That there is a place where, after death, disembodied spirits are kept till the day of Resurrection. That this place is not in itself a place of either happiness or misery; though those who inhabit it may be and must be happy or miserable according to the lives they have lived on earth. For the same place held the soul of the rich man when he was tormented, and the soul of Lazarus when he was comforted; there was, indeed, a partition, a gulf between the two, but they are represented as being, nevertheless, near enough to communicate with each other; the same place received the soul of Christ and of the penitent thief, who must have been in the enjoyment of such felicity as may arise from the favour of God and the sense of being in safety; the same place, to come to my text, held the spirits which once were disobedient in the days of Noah, and the spirit of Christ which went and preached to those thus kept in prison or custody.

And this brings us to a closer examination of the very curious and wonderful truth which God has been pleased to reveal to us by His Apostle Peter, when we are told that Christ went in the spirit, for so it ought to be rendered, that Christ went in spirit, so far as His spirit was concerned, without any instrumentality of the body, and preached to the spirits in prison or custody.

The first remark I shall make upon these words is, that there is nothing in the original word translated prison which denotes punishment. It merely means custody, or safe-keeping; such custody and safe-keeping as might be used whether to prevent escape, or to protect from attack. The invisible world is a place where all the souls of the departed are in safe-keeping: protected, on the one hand, against all external foes; and, on the other, prevented from escaping so as to avoid their future doom. Which of these two ideas shall predominate must be determined by the nature of those spoken of. The souls of the wicked may well be conceived as desirous of escaping if they could, because they anticipate but too surely the end awaiting them. The souls of the righteous, on the other hand, must be conceived as rejoicing in the sense of safety from all intrusion, of being kept within the precincts of their mansion from all interference by powers without, until, in the words of our burial service, they shall have their final consummation and bliss in that eternal and everlasting glory which shall be inaugurated on the great day of the Resurrection.

Taken thus you will then perceive how the article of our Church and the clause of the Apostles' Creed harmonise with the inspired declaration of St. Peter. And you will see this still more plainly when you take certain other words of St. Peter into account. Christ, says that Apostle, went in spirit, and preached to the spirits in safe-keeping, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. Now the assertion contained in these words is evidently antithetic. The flesh and the spirit are opposed to each other, just as being put to death is opposed to being quickened or made to live. If, therefore, the flesh be the flesh of Christ, so must likewise the spirit here mentioned be the spirit of Christ; and thus the Apostle's meaning evidently is that, as Christ was put to death in the flesh, so far as his bodily nature was concerned, so He was quickened, or made to live, so far as His spirit was concerned: in other words, that the spirit of Christ was not touched or affected by the death passed upon His body. The Apostle is not here speaking of our Saviour's bodily resurrection from the dead, but of the continuous life of His spirit: that spirit which no pangs of mortality could touch; that spirit whose life enabled him to take again His life in the body after having freely laid it down.

The whole text, therefore, should be rendered and explained thus:—

Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in spirit, *i.e.*, surviving in His spirit, or immaterial part, that stroke of death which His body had sustained, in which spirit, thus surviving death, He went and preached to the spirits in safe-keeping.

We now come to the most difficult part of our subject, the consideration of the nature of these spirits, and of the nature of that preaching or proclamation which Christ addressed to them during the interval between His death and His resurrection.

The spirits in safe-keeping are described as having been formerly disobedient in the days of Noah while the ark was being prepared.

We are told in Genesis that the term of God's endurance before the Deluge of the wickedness of the then existing race of man was limited to one hundred and twenty years. It must then be conceived that Noah, who is elsewhere called a preacher of righteousness, proclaimed to the stubborn and disobedient race the limits of God's patience, and endeavoured, by making known to them the coming judgment, to bring them to repentance. But they, in headstrong wickedness, refused to listen. They remained disobedient. And so their lives were forfeited in that deluge by which a godless and impious race was swept away to make room for the descendants of a single pious family. The spirits in safe keeping, therefore, must be understood as comprising the multitudes whom the deluge drowned.

The proclamation of Christ addressed to them is, I think, sufficiently explained by the invariable sense of the word "proclaim" or "preach" in the

New Testament. That word means to announce the Gospel: to proclaim the approach of the Kingdom of God. We must then conceive our Blessed Lord to have proclaimed to these formerly disobedient spirits the Gospel, or good news of the Grace of God, made known to man in His Person as their Saviour.

Now it seems repugnant to all our convictions of the love of Christ to us that He should have proclaimed this good news to the spirits in safe keeping if they could derive no benefit from it. To tell them of the love of God, and the mercy of God to others, whilst they themselves were excluded from all share in it, would have been only to aggravate their sufferings. We are, I think, driven to conclude that the message which the disembodied spirit of Christ bore to these disembodied spirits was one of peace and reconciliation, not one tantalising them with the prospect of a happiness from which they were for ever shut out.

If this be so, and I do not understand how any other view can be taken which agrees with the meaning of the passage, then the words of St. Peter seem to open up a prospect of reconciliation and salvation to multitudes who have here on earth never had any chance, humanly speaking, of these infinite blessings. For why should the souls of those disobedient before the deluge alone be selected to hear that heavenly message? Does not the communication of it to some especial sinners seem in equity to demand the communication of it to all who have never heard it here?

This view may possibly appear strange and startling to you, and yet there is one phrase used by our Lord Himself, which seems to imply the possibility of repenting and being forgiven in a future state. Of the sin against the Holy Ghost He declares that it shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come. These words hardly admit of any other explanation than that there are some sins which admit of being forgiven in the world to come, though they have not been forgiven in this.

Such conclusions, may be, would probably have been more generally drawn from the passage now before us, and that I have just cited, had they not been supposed to encourage the delusion of purgatory. But the slightest consideration will prove to you that that doctrine has nothing in common with the explanation I have given of St. Peter's words. Purgatory is supposed to be a place where the souls not of the disobedient, but of the obedient are kept, not simply in custody, but in torments, for the purpose of cleansing them from the stains of sin. St. Peter speaks of a place not of torment, but simply of custody, in which the spirits, not of imperfectly righteous men, but of the obstinately disobedient are kept. Purgatory is a place for those who know the truth but only imperfectly obey it. St. Peter's prison-house is a place for those who knew the truth up to a certain point, and absolutely refused accepting it. Purgatory is a place in which no proclamation of the Gospel needs being made, seeing that only those who knew the Gospel are in it. St. Peter's prison is a place where Christ needed to proclaim his gracious work, because those confined there had never heard of it. Purgatory is a place from which souls may be delivered sooner or later by the prayers and alms and sacrifices of the faithful, or by the indulgence of the Pope. St. Peter's prison is a place where the spirits of all are kept alike unto the day of judgment. Purgatory, to conclude, is a lucrative device to gain money for the Church, and to rivet her fetters on the human mind; whilst there is not one word in the representation of St. Peter which could by the utmost ingenuity be tortured into the notion that the prayers or alms or masses of the faithful, or the indulgence of any of those bishops who call themselves St. Peter's peculiar successors, can rescue out of their prison the spirits there awaiting the general resurrection. Finally, the idea of purgatory was unknown to the Primitive Church and early fathers, while the explanation of my text which I have given was generally accepted by them.

In conclusion, you may perhaps ask, what are the lessons to be derived from the passage I have endeavoured to explain? Lessons there must be, and useful lessons too; for it is quite against the genius of our religion to suppose anything uselessly revealed to us. Let us then try and discover some, at least, of the more obvious lessons this very extraordinary disclosure of St. Peter teaches.

I. And in the first place, I think, we may well read in this text the tender love of our heavenly Father, and of His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. God's mercy was not satisfied with the first rejection of His offers made by these disobedient spirits. He might have acquiesced in it, but He would not give them up for ever without making one more attempt to convert them. I will send unto them My Son; peradventure they will hear and reverence Him. And if God's dealings are uniform, as we must believe they are, O what encouragement may we not hence derive as to the future prospects of those countless myriads who have never on earth heard the joyful news of pardon and peace!

II. The second lesson to be derived from this passage, and the whole doctrine connected with it, is the importance of the resurrection. People in modern times seem to have almost forgotten the Scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the body. They talk of the immortality of the soul: they speak of the burden of the flesh, and they almost invariably use language which implies that those who die in Christ go at once to heaven. But such is not the doctrine of the New Testament. Nothing does it more plainly teach than that the final

happiness of the righteous in heaven, as well as the final misery of the wicked in hell, does not begin till after the judgment, and follows the general resurrection. Up to that time there is an existence in a disembodied state, in which both happiness and misery are imperfect: a state of safe-keeping from all external interference, in which it would seem that repentance, in certain cases, is not impossible. But the being for ever at home with the Lord commences not till we shall have heard the summons which shall resuscitate the dead, and restore the spirit to a mansion, a spiritual body, fit for its inhabitation, and able to do all its behests. The resurrection of the body, not the mere immortality of the soul is the cardinal truth of Christianity.

III. Finally, the last lesson I would inculcate is deduced not so much from the teaching of the passage now before us, as from the attempts that have been made to get rid of its obvious sense, lest that sense should seem to favour Romish abuses. I have shewn you that there is no connexion whatever between those abuses and the plain meaning of St. Peter; but such a connexion has been by many Protestant expositors supposed to exist, and the apprehension of it has induced them in too many instances to deal deceitfully with the Word of God, and to do violence to its evident meaning. Protestants have erred more than once in this way; and our conceptions of many parts of Scripture have been vitiated by the supposed necessity of making them speak a different language from that which Rome employs. But the truth is, that to ascertain the real sense of Scripture it is absolutely requisite to put away all correctives, all modern ideas: to transport ourselves as much as possible into the times and circumstances of the sacred writers, and to accept what they and their contemporaries would plainly have taken out of their words. If we wish to hear what God the Lord will speak to us, we must listen simply to His voice, and not be thinking of other things, and of possible misconceptions of His meaning. We must be docile and teachable, and eschew all reduction of Divine truth to the cramping limits of human systems, or of supposed logical necessities. We must yield ourselves to be taught, and not presume to teach the Great Teacher what He ought to say.

The *Record* says the costs of the St. Vedast case remain unpaid, and the sequestration has issued. The tenants of the Rev. Pelham Dale's freehold property at Orpington, in Kent, have been served with notices to become tenants and pay rent to the sequestrators.

The *Daily News* says the Queen has presented a stained-glass window to St. Mary's, Bury St. Edmund's, in memory of Mary Tudor, daughter of Henry VII., often called "Mary, the French Queen," as she married first Louis XII. of France, and afterwards Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. The chief episodes of her eventful history are depicted in the window.

MAN'S WORK AND GOD'S WORK IN SALVATION.

By the Rev. BASIL M. JONES, M.A., Vicar of Llanfair, near Ruthin.

Sermon Preached in St. Asaph Cathedral on Friday Evening, December 3rd, 1880.

"Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure."—Philippians ii. 12, 13.

IT is perhaps worthy of remark that the people to whom the Apostle wrote these words were the inhabitants of a city which was the first place on the continent of Europe in which the Gospel was preached—also, that the Church which the Apostle planted in this city was one which seems to have been especially dear to him. That he held the members of this Church in great respect is pretty evident from the opening words of our text, in which he compliments them upon their steadfastness, not only during his presence, but much more, as he says, during his absence. Of the Christian converts at Philippi he has scarcely a single word of complaint to record. No Epistle is so warm as this one in its expressions of affection. Sometimes the writer seems as if he hardly could find words to pour out the fulness of his love—"My brethren, dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, my dearly beloved."

The subject suggested to us by the text is one of the Divine mysteries of our faith—the work of man and the work of God in the salvation of the soul. All I can hope to do this evening in connexion with the subject which I have chosen for our meditation, is to set before you a few simple, and, perhaps you will say, very elementary thoughts, as they have occurred to my own mind. But I trust that, however simple and elementary, they may not be without their use, if they should only serve to remind you of truths heard a hundred times before, but which, it may be, you have often lost sight of and forgotten.

We find here and there in the Bible man's duty summed up in a few words—"Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man," says the wise preacher of old. So the Apostle St. Paul, in the text, puts before the Christian what ought to be the necessary outcome of all Gospel teaching—"Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you to will and to do of His good pleasure." Here we find, first the duty, then the spirit in which that duty is to be performed; and lastly, the reason why it is to be performed in such a spirit.

And now let us enquire what we mean by Salvation. Salvation is a state of spiritual health and well-being. The soul came into this world in a

state of spiritual disease, inherited from our first parents. God sent His Son to be the Physician of men's souls—to restore them to a condition of spiritual health, to prepare them, partly by certain means to be used and applied by all alike, partly by a thousand varying processes suited to the ever-varying needs of each individual soul—thus gradually to prepare them during their several periods of probation here to be partakers with Him in His eternal glory hereafter. This is a brief sketch of what we mean by Salvation.

I. Now St. Paul in the text says that we have to "work out our own salvation." It is a remarkable expression; scarcely, however, as strong a word in our language as it is in the original text. We are sometimes apt to think that because Christ our Saviour has done so much for us, therefore that we have nothing to do. It is common enough to hear people say: "Christ has done everything for me; all I have to do is to believe in Him and to trust in His all-sufficient merits, and all will be well." Surely, my brethren, this is only a partial representation of a Divine truth. The Apostle, in the verses which go before the text, reminds the converts at Philippi of Christ's work for man—how, though very God, yet He humbled Himself and became man, "and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross." Then he bursts forth in the words of the text, and tells them to "work out their own salvation." This, as I said, is a Divine mystery. Perhaps it would help us to understand it were we to turn for a moment from the spiritual to the natural kingdom. We all own that God is the Creator and Preserver of every living thing. No one but an unbeliever denies this. Yet God calls man to be His fellow-worker. We may take this as a maxim of universal application—that man cannot do anything without God, and that God will do nothing without man in those operations of His which He carries on for the support of man's bodily or spiritual life. To take a simple familiar instance. The farmer cultivates his land and sows his seed, but having done that he has done all. All the rest is God's work—"first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Think, again, of the labourer "going forth to his work and to his labour until the evening"—rising up early and going late to rest, and eating the bread of carefulness, earning his daily bread by the sweat of his brow. What would be the consequence were the farmer or the labourer to cease to perform their respective duties in life? Famine, poverty and misery, anarchy and confusion, would everywhere stare us in the face. Then have we not in these instances specimens of God's work and man's work in the temporal world? It is not otherwise in the spiritual world—in the Kingdom of Grace. Here, again, man can do nothing without God, and God will do nothing without man. Take an instance, and suppose we begin at the very beginning of the spiritual life. We will picture to ourselves a child brought by its parents to receive the Holy Sacrament of Baptism. The germ of Divine Grace is then planted in the soul of that child. But those who have the care of that child are solemnly charged to take care that it be "virtuously brought up to lead a Godly and a Christian life." When that child has come to years of discretion he solemnly binds himself in the presence of God and His people to withstand the Devil and all his works, and to continue unto his life's end in the state of salvation in which he was placed at the commencement of it? But what does all this imply? Unceasing labour, constant cultivation, constant watchfulness and discipline of the soul. Else would thorns and briars spring up in abundance and choke the good seed sown, so as effectually to prevent it from bringing forth fruit unto perfection. Yet man's best energies and his most strenuous exertions in the work of his salvation are nothing worth unless he finds Christ in all those divinely-appointed means of which he avails himself for the strengthening and refreshing of his soul. Christ in God is the Author and Finisher of our faith. Without Him all our righteousness is of no value whatever. At the same time, though Christ has purchased Redemption for us at so enormous a cost, yet we are bidden to "work out our own salvation." Of His work He Himself said on the Cross that "it is finished." Nothing can add to, nothing can take away from, the priceless value of that finished work. But our work—your work and my work—can never be finished till we have passed from the kingdom of grace to the kingdom of glory.

II. But now the Apostle says that this work is to be done "with fear and trembling." Why so?

(1) Because of the importance of the work. How full of anxious fear we always are when we are engaged in any work which we consider important or necessary to our welfare, or advantageous to us in any way. Very likely the subject is never absent from our minds during any of our waking moments. The more important the work, the greater will be our anxiety concerning it.

(2) Again, "With fear and trembling." Surely, because in this work we are brought face to face with God—the sinner brought into contact with the Fountain of Holiness. Think of those many instances in Holy Writ of fear such as this—our first parents hiding themselves amid the trees of the garden when they heard God's voice; Moses at the bush; the Israelites at Sinai. But perhaps the instance most appropriate to the present subject is that furnished by the Apostle himself, labouring incessantly for others, and at the same time working out his own salvation "with fear and trembling"—miraculously converted, as we know, yet never ceasing to watch and pray, continually exercising himself with the sharpest discipline. Who can ever forget those memorable words—"I keep under my body and bring it into subjection,

lest that by any means when I have preached to others I myself should be a castaway." Thus St. Paul worked out his own salvation "with fear and trembling."

III. And now observe the reason which he gives why we should thus work out our own salvation: "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." This is the greatest consolation which we have in our life's work—that it has to be done not in our own strength, but in the strength which God supplies; otherwise the task would be hopeless indeed. Men, it is true, have often attempted to work in reliance upon their own unaided strength; but such attempts have always ended in miserable failure. Turn to the ancient history of God's people. See the facts recorded there for our learning and admonition, which, though facts, are not mere facts, but types of great spiritual truths which have been exemplified over and over again in every age of the Church of God. Think of Samson, type of great physical powers, not wholly consecrated to the service of God, and therefore ending in wreck and ruin. Think again of Solomon, type of high intellectual gifts, not coupled with perseverance in well-doing. Think of the persuasive eloquence in which he everywhere depicts the treasures of Divine Wisdom, in whose pleasant ways and peaceful paths he himself was not content to walk; powerfully preaching to others, himself, as far as can be discerned by human judgment, becoming a castaway. These are typical instances, which are continually finding their counterpart in the lives of men. The radical fault in all such cases is the abuse of the Divine gift of Free Will. These men might have known if they would, even with their imperfect light, that "it is God which worketh in man both to will and to do of His good pleasure." How much more do we know it with the Gospel of Jesus Christ in our hands, and the encouragement and exhortations of His holy Apostles. To "will and to do," says St. Paul in the text. Does not this show us that the work of salvation is not a mechanical work? Man is not in any sense like a machine, which works in obedience to certain laws over which itself has no control. No, my brethren, our work as Christians is to be a willing and a reasonable service. God has given us the gift of a free will. It is true that we are constantly surrounded by the danger of acting mechanically, even in the sacred duties of our holy religion—of rendering a cold and formal service, satisfied with the mere performance of the act, careless of the motive with which it is done. The Apostle says in another place—"He is not a Jew which is one outwardly." So we may adapt his words and say—"He is not a Christian which is one outwardly but which is one inwardly, and true religion, that is, a real working out of our own salvation, is that of the heart in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God." God has given each of us a free will, but it is of "His good pleasure" to work mightily in us—to give us not only the will to please Him, but also the power to carry out His purposes on our behalf. "He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the (certain) knowledge of the truth." Yes, He willeth that we should all be saved, but it rests with us to accept the offer of salvation. Even His gracious purpose is limited by this condition—that we should accept His offer, and so come to realise His truth in the salvation of our souls.

And now, in conclusion, you may perhaps desire that I should point out some practical way in which the work of salvation may be furthered by each of us at the present time. And so I would venture to call your attention to the services of our Church at this holy season. Let us take them one by one as they come before us, and apply their sacred teaching to ourselves.

(1) The call to awake out of sleep has once more sounded in our ears, and we are reminded that we are drawing nearer and nearer to the goal of glory and salvation. And as a consequence of this we are bidden to cast off the works of darkness. A Christian congregation would not need to be reminded of this saving for the fact that our Saviour and His Apostles everywhere place side by side with great and grievous sins things which we are tempted to think are no sins at all, but only perhaps pardonable weaknesses. For instance, side by side with rioting and drunkenness and worse sins, are placed strife and envy.

(2) Next we are called upon at this sacred season to the more diligent study of God's Holy Word, which the Apostle says is able to make us "wise unto salvation." We are not to read it as if it were only an ordinary book of history, poetry, or philosophy in order to enjoy the pleasure which such study would afford us, but to mark and to learn and to inwardly digest and apply to ourselves the sacred lessons it contains—to embrace its promises, and to be admonished by its warnings.

(3) Again, Are we engaged in the sacred ministry of Christ's Church? Advent reminds us of our duty, stirs us up to be more faithful, that we may indeed be able to prepare and make ready Christ's way, as did the Baptist of old, by "turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just." Or are we among those who are ministered unto? Then we are reminded that we should receive with all love the ministrations offered and the Word spoken, as they did of whom the Apostle wrote—"For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of man, but as it is in truth the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe."

(4) Finally, Advent calls us to forbearance and gentleness of spirit. "Let your moderation be known unto all men." Away with the spirit of

contention and self-seeking and rivalry. Be content with less than perhaps may be your due. Let mutual consideration and reasonableness of dealing be the rule of your practice in all the affairs of life—in fact, the spirit which was also in Christ Jesus. Why? Because "the Lord is at hand." Remember that it is not only great and manifest sins which shut out the thought of Christ and His nearness. Over-carefulness may do it. Want of moderation in our business and our pleasures may do it. Brooding anxiety may do it. He who is ever mindful that his Lord is at hand learns to commit his anxieties to God, and to cast all his care upon Him. He makes a business of the concerns of his soul, watching and working, and connecting all his doings with the thought of Him who is even now standing at the door—denying himself in every time of temptation, and crowding every day of his brief, quickly-passing life with the acts of a new obedience—setting his affections on things above, and not on things on the earth.

Thus, my brethren, may we endeavour to work out our own salvation "with fear and trembling," cheered and sustained amid all our conflicts by the ever-present thought that after all "it is God which worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1881.

WE fear that our respected correspondents who write against the Contagious Diseases Acts are "irreconcileables," who will not be convinced by any amount of argument or evidence; but as the issues of the question are of such tremendous importance, not only to the bodily health and vigour, but also to the spiritual health and morality of the present and future generations of our countrymen, we trust that our readers will tolerate, if not assist in, the discussion a little longer. "Miss Bewicke," "An Irishwoman," "E. T.," "Veritas," and others, think people can be made chaste by Act of Parliament, and that the fear of a great but half-concealed or unseen plague will be sufficient to "stem the tide of human passion;" consequently that sanitary legislation is not only not required, but actually encourages and puts a premium upon vice. "Veritas," in the letter we print to-day, actually bids us stand upon the high bank of public morality and not allow the good ship "Contagious Diseases Act" to land the thousands of victims of vice that she has rescued from the said stream of human passions; even to throw a plank to any of the sinking sufferers would be a grievous sin, although he bids us show our Christian love (?) by singing *Gloria in Excelsis* to the diseased and sinking wretches. He thinks the diminution of prostitutes in the protected towns to be attributed to girls' friendly societies, &c.; if so, why have the numbers actually increased in the Haymarket and other unprotected places? He blames us for making abandoned women healthy; surely, setting aside Christian precepts, it is better to have them sound than diseased. Again, he blames us for advocating exceptional, experimental, and temporary legislation as a means of accomplishing an end not very clearly stated. Assuredly we have more than once stated that the aim of the Acts was to heal the sick, to cleanse the lepers, and thus prevent the leprosy from descending to future generations. It is a disease which saps the strength, and by consequence the morality of the future race. The alleged questionable means to this Christian end, so graphically described by him, we believe to exist only in "Veritas's" exuberant imagination. Were he not a professed preacher of good tidings we should be inclined to say that his logic was as bad as his Gospel.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CHURCH-BUILDING.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—I like Canon Rawstorne's main view of Church-Building excepting in one important, very important, particular. He has never thought out what true Art is. All shape is a language. The table I am writing at is a man's thought of what is a good writing support put into wood. Every building, therefore, is as much a thought of man's as to the best way of living if it is a dwelling-house, of worshipping if it is a church, as a statement in words on the same subject would be. And a bad building—I mean a building which is not in harmony with the builder's station in life, and the object he has in view—is, as far as the badness goes, as much an untruth, a lie, as the same badness in words would be. True art is speaking the most living truth simply in the truest and best way, whether it be in stone, or paint, or musical sound, or any other way of putting mind into shape. God never speaks of art in the New Testament because He speaks of that heart-power of truth which, if true, is, when it takes outward shape, the highest art. But in the Old Testa-

ment whole books, it may be said, are devoted to Art. God prescribed the exact way of killing a bullock, the colour of a fringe, the shape of a robe, &c., &c. Till all men recognise that Beauty is the highest thought in the truest shape, and true Art the effort to understand and produce this, Art will continue to be the baby-work which even our greatest artists in words, in paint, in stone, often make it.

Sept. 9, 1881. EDWARD THRING.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

SIR,—In your leading article of August 6th, in reference to a short letter from myself which appeared in the same issue of the PULPIT, you say that "you advocate these Acts entirely on Christian grounds, and as being in accord with the 'Bible code of morals.'" And you say further: "Surely 'Veritas' does not contend that because this legislation has a sanitary aim it is therefore un-Christian and immoral?" Your correspondent "Cui Bono," in the PULPIT of August 13th, indicates my views on this head, and to his pertinent letter, of which you speak favourably in your leader of August 20th, I would beg to add a few remarks. His letter amplified the views expressed in my own, and rendered it unnecessary at the time for me to answer your strictures on my own. But after carefully reviewing the correspondence that ensued, in which the arguments seemed to me to indicate that the supporters and the opponents of the Acts were treating the subject from such different points of view, that there seemed no probability of one side convincing the other, or of any approximation of views, such as that anticipated by "A Surgeon" in your last issue, taking place as the result of the discussion, I have jotted down a few points which have struck me most forcibly, which go far to explain why I hold that the same "platform" will not accommodate both parties, since the one put forward by the supporters of the Acts seems to the opponents thereof as narrow as the footboard which is thrown across from pier to steamer, when the latter is discharging its living freight at one of its river-side stations. Label the steamer "Contagious Diseases Acts," and the pier "Public Morality," then "Sanitary Legislation" is the bridge—(suggestive, to my mind, of the "Bridge of Sighs" at Venice)—which is to serve as common ground, a *modus vivendi*, to the opposing disputants. But there is a "great gulf" between, and it is one not easily crossed by the advocates of "public morality," though the advocates of the Contagious Diseases Acts think they can maintain their position alternately, as most convenient to them, at one or other extremity of the landing-stage.

The following are some of the chief points where I join issue with the advocates of sanitary legislation, as inclined to "magnify their own peculiar province." (*Vide* quotation in "A Surgeon's" letter of 13th Sept.)

I. They assign wholly to sanitary legislation the lessening of the number of abandoned women, since the Contagious Diseases Acts became law, to the almost entire exclusion of other influences. I had imagined that such agencies as the Girls' Friendly Society, with its 50,000 members, as the result of nearly six years' work, and the analogous Young Women's Association—the rules of which are not, however, quite so stringent and exclusive—and other kindred organizations, had had some little share in the promotion of virtue amongst the classes with which they deal. As "A Surgeon" well remarks: "Long before it was proper, still less fashionable, for ladies to discuss this subject, they were working silently, doing all the good they could without any encouragement." And as Napoleon Buonaparte also well observed, the want of France was "mothers"; by which, I suppose, he meant that mothers have in their hands the framing of the characters of their children. I think he struck a key-note there, and one which needs to be struck again, and in more countries than one.

II. The opponents of the Contagious Diseases Acts are challenged—if they find fault with the working of the Acts—to suggest some more efficacious means of promoting the public *health*. We should like to see a "considerable diminution in the number of prostitutes," but it sounds like a contradiction in terms to hope to accomplish this by bringing about "a great amelioration of their condition."

III. You, Mr. Editor, with several of your correspondents, and certain clerical advocates of the Acts (in Convocation, Canterbury Province, Session this year) appear to support them, as exceptional, experimental, and temporary means towards accomplishing some apparently desirable end, one, however, which is not very clearly stated, at least is not so plainly brought forward as it ought to be to enlist the co-operation of those whose motto is *Gloria in Excelsis*, as well as "Good Will towards men," or as some would render it *pro bono publico*. But to judge from the arguments employed, the end, whatever it may be, is not such as to justify the use of questionable means. To my humble understanding they seem to amount to this :—

(*a.*) That it is desirable to accommodate the dregs of our army and navy by allowing, under certain restrictions, houses of ill-fame to exist in order to be frequented by characters as loose and abandoned as those who are the protégées of such paternal legislation.

(*b.*) That it is desirable to keep a sort of Governmental Registration office in each of our barrack and seaport towns, and to require unfortunate women to report themselves in the same way as if they held "Tickets of leave," as a condition of their enjoying the privilege of entering these brothels. And further, to instruct certain officials to file or enter a periodical statistical record of diseased cases, in some inquisitorial "Index Expurgatorius," after making these unfortunate cases the subjects of a worse than Spanish inquisition, the victims of a falsely supposed social necessity, in order that the annual percentages of cases consigned to hospital may demonstrate the usefulness of the said Acts, but also—unhappy corollary—in order that the patients, as soon as cured and discharged, may safely return—for a while—to their "wallowing in the mire."

(*c.*) In the case of civilians, for whose immorality the same excuse does not exist as for that of those who follow callings in which celibacy is of necessity the *rule*, to enable if not to encourage them to dispense with the virtues of the married state, without running the risk of incurring the physical penalties of unregulated vice, or the inconvenience of the weekly magisterial penalty imposed in affiliation cases. It cannot be supposed that only pauper civilians and wandering gipsies will disregard the seventh commandment as it stands in the Book of Exodus when a paternal legislature renders it safe—as regards temporal pains and penalties—to disregard it. Such legislation as the Contagious Diseases

Acts, puts a construction upon the words "Thou shalt *not*," which merely omits the negative, and which may be assumed in justification of this apparently slight alteration or omission to reason something after this style :—"Butler and Paley were both mistaken. The laws of nature as they understood them, are not the laws of God, and therefore it is safe to fight against or ignore them. The translators of the Book of Exodus, and of the Epistle to the Romans were likewise mistaken. In the original the seventh commandment runs thus :—'Of evil fruit thou mayst freely eat. Ye shall not surely die!'" And the words of St. Paul are as follows :—"Men and women may violate the laws of humanity, they may change the natural use into that which is against nature, *without* receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which is meet! Only bestow your patronage and support upon the staff of licensed hirelings, whom we have subjected to periodical, wholesome, sanitary supervision, only resort to those harmless underlings whom we can answer for, by reason of the salutary discipline of our Contagious Diseases Acts, and you need be under no apprehension as to the consequences. We have that indulgent and paternal regard for your natural instincts and inclinations, for the animal propensities of our soldiers and sailors, and of those of our civilians, and the citizens of our large towns who are unable or unwilling to change their present condition for the married state, that we will render prostitution no longer an *illicit* trade," as Dr. Johnson would perhaps define it, "but will provide facilities for its becoming a recognised feature in our complex social machinery, a legitimate element in our expansive constitution."

This, Mr. Editor, is the way in which the argument on behalf of the above Acts presents itself, despite your adverse strictures, to the mind of

Long Acre, E.C., VERITAS.

Festival of St. Matthew, 1881.

SIR,—May I suggest for discussion what seems to me the best remedy available for checking the evil with which the Contagious Diseases Act is trying to deal. But what I have to suggest is so contrary happily to the general sentiment of your readers, that I would not have hoped for your giving it publicity had not the infinitely more repugnant views of Mr. Voysey (modestly stated by him) found a place in your columns. The remedy I venture to suggest then is a well regulated Polygamy, backed by a law that every seducer of females should be bound to provide for their victims as for wives, which they really are, as St. Paul teaches when warning men against the sin of fornication. And however impossible it may appear to obtain legislation of the sort indicated, why, with the example of Ireland before us, can we doubt that the Government will refuse anything if only the agitation of the people be sufficiently urgent.

Polygamy is not adultery or fornication, and may well be adopted, I think, in the present distress, though "from the beginning it was not so," if even the hardness of our hearts in our fallen state cannot or will not abide by the monogamy instituted for the unfallen denizens of Eden. Nor do I see that saints under the new law would sin any more than those under or prior to the law of Moses by the practice of polygamy. Further, the baneful effects confessedly produced by polygamy in barbarous states need not necessarily have similar results in well governed countries like ours (*excipe Hiberniam*).

My suggestions are the outcome of forty years of anxious thought respecting the rampant evil of prostitution, and I do believe that polygamy is the only available outlet for our surplus female population, the only, or one of the chief, means for keeping crowds of girls from a life of prostitution to the ruin of themselves and that of an unknown number of others erring or innocent.

CLK.

The World gives the following interesting sketch of the Rev. John Russell at Black Torrington :—"A reputation wide as the fame of English field-sports has made the name of Jack Russell a household word wherever foxhunters congregate ; and rare social qualities have so endeared him to many friends, that he finds warm welcome among them, from John o'Groat's to the Land's End. It is indeed difficult to say where he may be most aptly described as 'at home,' for in no true sportsman's house within the three westernmost counties would he be regarded as a stranger; and in the place where his lot is for the present cast he has probably fewer familiar associates than elsewhere. He has lived to near the close of his eighty-sixth year without making a single enemy in the world, or losing a friend save by the hand of the inevitable breaker of all human ties. Of the wealth that attracts false friends he never had a large share. See him where you will—at the end of a run with fox or stag, whether among the wild tors of Dartmoor or in the most distant combes of Exmoor—and he is sure to be surrounded by young and old, all of whom would go miles out of their way to ride with him if they could do him a service by it. When he leaves them, his cheery 'God bless you all!' is echoed by nothing but hearty good wishes. Ask him which way he is going then, and his answer will probably be, 'As far towards home as I can get to-night.' He knows by long experience that wherever he chooses to halt the best the house can offer will be at his disposal, and a hearty welcome given to him as if he were one of the family. A sketch of him in the saddle, stealing quietly along on a ridge, while staghounds were making merry with their music the deep valley below; or, as Carter painted him not long ago, jogging along a heather-clad hill in the fading light of an autumn evening, with old Jack Babbage, erstwhile huntsman of the Devon and Somerset, and a tired pack for company, might, with happy appropriateness, be entitled 'The Reverend Jack Russell at Home.' So long as he can hear the notes of horn and hound, or talk with those who have something of his own deep love of sport, the veteran never seems to grow weary. And those who ride with him have surely less cause to tire while the cheery old man chats on, every ridge or deep combe or turn of the path serving to suggest a story. Hardly a mile in all that wide waste of moorland but is connected with some personal experience in which old comrades played a part. It must, indeed, be a long life that can thus people the wilderness with living memories, and a good one that can enable a man to look back on its many incidents with pleasure. Still more frequently Mr. Russell has no other company than his own thoughts when he rides over the moor, and yet no distance seems to dishearten him. Only a year or two ago he left the hounds, after they had killed their stag on the Quantocks, and set out to ride fifty-three miles home alone. When he

reached Molland Common a dense fog and darkness obscured every object. Suddenly a sound as of people talking reached him, and, bending down by his cob's neck to listen, he could hear a rustle of hoofs among the heather. 'Good-night, my lads!' he shouted; and the answer came back—"Good-night; I wish you was safe home by your fireside to Swimbridge.' 'Ah, so do I; but I must take the rough with the smooth, I suppose!' 'Well, you've done that all your life, han't'ee? Good-night.' So they passed on their way, and Mr. Russell never discovered who it was that had so quickly recognised his voice and so happily hit off, in a sentence, his biography.

"No great gathering of staghunters on Exmoor would seem complete without his presence; and as surely as the opening day of the season dawns, he may be looked for among the throng on Cloutsham Ball, though the place of his present abode is fifty miles distant at least. In all likelihood he will have under his charge two or three young ladies, who regard it as an enviable honour to be entered to "the sport of kings' by its oldest follower. He calls every one 'my dear,' and kisses them all like a true west-country gallant of old; at least, rumour says they would feel sadly slighted if he did not. With young men he is as popular as with those of nearer his own age, though he often lectures them somewhat freely. It would be an ill-tempered churl, however, that could resent criticism or disregard advice in the field from one who has been a staghunter for sixty-eight years. On September 13th, 1814, John Russell, a young freshman from Oxford, saw his first wild red-deer killed on Exmoor. A Lord Fortescue was then master of the Devon and Somerset. The reverend sportsman has lived to see a great-grandson of that nobleman elected to the same office, and is still able to enjoy the sport of which he has been so long a devoted disciple. If he now and then takes advantage of the privilege of age, it must be remembered that he is exceptionally tolerant towards the follies of youth. One modern habit he has no liking for, and will not hesitate to tell anybody that he looks on it as unsportsmanlike. This distaste is not only a relic of the ancient prejudice, according to which smoking was regarded as a filthy practice, but arises from a feeling that cigars and pipes are as much out of place in the hunting-field as are pot-hats and stable-jackets. Down in the wild country round about his own parish of Black Torrington he is less exacting on these points; for there his 'little cry of hounds' has few followers except the farmers of the neighbourhood, and they have a right, he thinks, to do exactly as they please. His faculty for making friends everywhere is simply marvellous. He went to Black Torrington little more than a year ago. Then a hare was no sooner seen in the neighbourhood than shot. Mr. Russell started a pack of harriers last season; and since that time all occupiers of land for miles round have cheerfully preserved game for his sport. Hounds acknowledge the charm of his manner quite as readily as men do. Nobody probably ever showed a similar sympathy with their peculiarities, or the same kind of command over them. He will let them draw so wide at times that they are apparently lost to control. He carries a horn, but seldom needs it; and will not have a whip used. His voice, strong and clear as ever, is all that is wanted. Its stentorian notes may be heard a good mile off, and to it every one of the pack will fly in an instant. To spend a day with the great hunting parson and his harriers is a pleasure for which any true sportsman would cheerfully give up the most brilliant run with other hounds. At dinner, afterwards, he will be found as genial and entertaining a companion as one need desire; brimful of good Devonshire stories, which he tells with a mastery of the dialect that is inimitable. Always abstemious to a degree, he is hardly ever known to eat a luncheon or to take even a biscuit with him on hunting-days, though he may leave home at dawn and not return till long after dark. Twenty minutes after he gets back, however, dinner will be on the table, and whether it be the favourite leg of sweet Exmoor mutton, followed by apple-tart, or a simple dish of ham and eggs, makes little difference to his appetite. A single glass of wine, and perhaps a tumbler of hot grog, are all he ever indulges in, and his habits are a standing contradiction to the fallacy that conviviality necessarily degenerates into dissipation. Surrounded by trophies of the chase—the skin of a favourite hound or horse here, the slot of a gallant stag there, a portrait of the wife who was a helpmeet indeed for so many years of his life, and the counterfeit presentments of friends like Paul Treeby, 'the foxhunter rough and ready,'—everything seems to suggest a story. Hanging by the wall is a hunting crop that Jem Mason, the prince of steeplechase-riders, gave him only a day or two before he died. Here a memento of that first visit to Sandringham, when the veteran danced the old year out and the new year in with the Princess, who captivates the hearts of old and young alike; and on every side tributes from grateful couples, who, deeming it a happy augury to be united by him, had sent some tokens to signify their simple faith while as yet the honeymoon was at its full. He can say, as probably nobody else can, that he has not a picture—except two or three which were painted before his marriage—or a hound or a horse that was not a present from some friend. His pack has been formed of drafts from every part of England. Several of them were sent to him he knows not whence or by whom. Yet the donors must have known his favourite sort well, for most of the hounds have apparently been selected according to one type.

The pleasant little rectory of Black Torrington, belted by oak-trees on one side, flanked by stables and kennels (the latter cleverly adapted from mere sheds to their present purpose, the former rebuilt at some cost after a disastrous fire), and fronted by a lawn stretching down to a bit of verdant pasture, forms an abode of peace, where many of us would be glad to find rest from the world's ceaseless struggle and turmoil. Here surrounded by all the household gods that many associations have endeared to him, waited on by the trusty housekeeper and groom, who have grown accustomed to his habits in long and honoured service, he spends his days happily enough, though there are few neighbours among the parishioners, widely scattered over miles of unfruitful country round about with whom he can find congenial companionship. The squires of Buckland Filleigh, Halwell, and one or two other places more distant, are all with whom he has social intercourse when at home. For one month of every year a *locum tenens* occupies the rectory of Black Torrington, while Mr. Russell makes holiday somewhere near his old Exmoor friends. At all other seasons he does duty twice every Sunday in the venerable parish church, and many people come from afar to hear the famous 'worthy of Devon' preach.

Only those who know how monotonous and utterly dull life in an out-of-the-way Devonshire parish is

to one whose early days have been spent amid more stirring scenes can fully understand the fascination that hunting exercises for many west-country parsons, or believe that, with all his devotion to field-sports, a man like the Rev. John Russell may still be an exemplary clergyman. As nobody in Devon believes there can be any harm in honest sport, so nobody has the least difficulty in reconciling the two positions. Mr. Russell's clerical influence is perhaps the greater because of his sympathy with all classes in their harmless amusements. In return the parishioners are so considerate that they will neither have a wedding nor a christening on one of his hunting days. Nobody could have laboured more assiduously than he has done for less pay. Seven years ago he did double duty at South Molton and George Nympton for the miserable stipend of £80 a year. From 1832 to 1866, when he held the incumbency of Swimbridge and Landkey, his total income was £210, out of which he paid £84 for a house and £80 for a curate, and still, like Goldsmith's vicar, was 'passing rich on forty pounds a year.' Yet his memory clings to that as the happiest time of his life; and Black Torrington, with all its pecuniary advantages, will never have the same hold on him as the dear old home in that charming district by the borders of Exmoor, where nearly fifty years were passed, most of them in sweetest and most sympathetic companionship.

The *Oswestry Advertiser* states that on Sunday week a ceremony, which excited much interest, took place in the parish of Gwyddelwern, near Corwen. Amongst the candidates for confirmation were two young persons who had never been baptised, and their parents being Baptists, were anxious, as were also the candidates themselves, that the rite should be administered by immersion. The vicar, the Rev. T. W. Vaughan, wrote to the Bishop of St. Asaph on the subject, and his lordship replied :—"If you are satisfied with the candidates for Holy Baptism there can be no objection to your administering the rite by immersion if you can make suitable arrangements." This was accordingly done, the service being said in Welsh.

The Clergy Sea-Side Rest. It is perhaps not generally known, at any rate to visitors, that an Institution called the Clergy Sea-side Rest, has been opened at No. 7, Union-crescent, Margate, under the patronage of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Dover, and has been two seasons in operation. We feel sure that the object set forth by its promoters is a worthy one. The Committee aim at providing "a Home which should prove a House of Rest for Clergymen worn with work, where all degrees of clerical life, richer and poorer, rector and curate, would find a roof common to all." The visitors board themselves. The Home at present provides rooms and attendance for four sets of clergy and their wives, and to keep up this Institution annual subscriptions of about £130 are needed. It is but the "day of small things," but it is hoped, though "its beginning is small, its latter end will greatly increase." It is pleasant in reference to this young Institution, to note the words of Dr. Andrew Clark, on the occasion of his visit :—"I have just inspected with much satisfaction, the Clergy Sea-side Home. Its cleanliness and airiness, its neatness and comfort, and a pervading order with brightness, are admirable. The house is small; but it seems as well adapted for the object of the founders as such a house could be made. I am satisfied that the Home is worthy alike of a warm sympathy and a liberal support, and I trust that its benevolent promoters will be importunate in pressing its claims upon the public, and will neither rest nor give rest until they have built a detached and larger house, in modest grounds, overlooking the sea."—(Extract from C.S.S.R. Visitors' Book.) The visitors' book is full of testimony, from those who have "rested here awhile," to the good management and great kindness of the Lady Superintendent as well as to the attention of her servants. Contributions are solicited both from Laity and Clergy, and may be sent to the Bankers, Messrs. Barclay, Bevan, and Co., 54, Lombard-street, London; Messrs. Cobb and Co., Margate; or to the Rev. H. Woods Tindall (Chairman of Committee), 27, Athelstan-road, Margate.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ambrose, Rev. Owen Cole, rector of Creaton.
Barker, Rev. John Rosse, rector of Radwell-heath; vicar of Evesham.
Brereton, Rev. John Lloyd, curate of St. Mary, Barnsley; minister of the District of St. Peter, Barnsley.
Collis, Rev. T. W. S., minister of the District of St. Bartholomew, Brighton.
Davies, Rev. Samuel, curate of Heallan Amgoed, Carmarthenshire; rector of Llangludwen, Carmarthenshire.
De St. Croix, Rev. Henry Miles, rector of Bradfield Combust.
Eade, Rev. Eli, rector of Farndish.
Fletcher, Rev. John B., Minister of the District of All Souls', Eastbourne.
Furmston, Rev. Edward, perpetual curate of Mansergh.
Gover, Rev. Alfred Edward, rector of Carlton-with-Willingham.
Greaves, Rev. Talbot A. L., vicar of Melcombe Regis, Dorset; vicar of Clifton.
Greenhow, Rev. Edward, vicar of North Gosforth; vicar of Earsdon, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Griffiths, Rev. James, rector of Llanllwchaiarn; vicar of Llangranog, Cardiganshire.
Gunnery, Rev. Reginald, vicar of St. Mary's, Hornsey-rise; vicar of St. George's, Worthing.
Hodson, Rev. James Stephen, rector of South Luffenham, Rutland; rector of Sanderstead, Surrey.
Laurie, Rev. J. W. B., curate of Witham, Essex; incumbent of Holme, near Peterborough.
Lewis, Rev. Daniel, vicar of Bettws Garmon; vicar of Bettws Psarmon and the District Chapelry of St. John, Waenfawr, Carnarvon.
Lewis, Rev. Walter Sunderland, vicar of St. George's, Worthing; vicar of St. Mary's, Hornsey-rise.
Lloyd, Rev. Arthur, vicar of Hunston (to be held with Norton Rectory by Archbishop's faculty).
Marshall, Rev. Joseph H., vicar of Sidlesham.
Millar, Rev. Canon, rural dean and vicar of Cirencester; rector of Christian Malford, Wilts.
Parker, Rev. William Hasell, curate of All Saints'; vicar of All Saints', Cockermouth.
Reade, Rev. Robert Charles Lewin, rector of Stowlangtoft.
Reeve, Rev. Charles Robert, rector of Great Henny.
Robinson, Rev. Henry, vicar of Westfield.
Rooper, Rev. John George, rector of Abbots Ripton.
Ryan, Right Rev. Bishop, vicar of St. Peter, Bournemouth; rector of Middleham.
Strand, Rev. Alexander, vicar of Holy Trinity, Hinckley.
Wood, Rev. Robert, vicar of Christ Church, Erith; rector of Halstead.
Wright, Rev. C. H., curate of Lambeth; rector of Keston, near Beckenham.
Wyatt, Rev. W., vicar of Hope-under-Dinmore, Herefordshire; rector of Broughton, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Aston, Rev. John Walter, M.A., vicar of Ambleside, at Ambleside, on the 17th inst., aged 28.
Drummond, Rev. Heneage, M.A., at Leckhampstead Rectory, on the 13th inst., aged 71.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FUNERAL SERMON FOR DEAN STANLEY.

By CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY ON SUNDAY, JULY 24, 1881.

"And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."—REV. xiv. 13.

THE hearts of us all are beating with sorrow to-day as the heart of one man. There is not one of us who is not grieving for the loss of that beloved and honoured friend, who for eighteen eventful and, for the most part, very happy years, has presided over this great church. Under such circumstances, I cannot but speak of him. I had wished that this morning's sermon should have been preached by others who knew him longer; it could hardly have been preached by any one who honoured or loved him more. Worthier lips than mine will speak of him in this Abbey to-day. They will make up for a tribute which must be all the feebler, because I cannot trust myself to say half of what I feel. The affection and the sympathy of you who loved him will make every allowance for troubled and imperfect words.

I may not dwell on the story of the life of this last son of the generous father, of the saintly mother, whose virtues have been recorded by his own filial love. I must not dwell upon the childhood, moulded by such influences in the quiet parsonage; nor on the stainless boyhood, trained by the bravest of modern teachers, of which you may recognise a sketch in the bright "Arthur" of "Tom Brown's School Days;" nor on the happy Oxford days, so crowned with academic laurels—the Balliol Scholarship, the Ireland Scholarship, the Latin Essay, the English Essay, the Newdigate Prize, the University Fellowship, the Professorship, the Christ Church Canonry. Even then his work was more memorable than the world knows. A well-known High Church clergyman writes that his appearance at Oxford as Professor of Ecclesiastical History amid the gloom caused by great secessions to Rome, did untold good among the youth of Oxford by saving them from dangerous reaction and by rekindling an interest in Scripture studies. But of those years some may speak hereafter; I will at once pass to others of his blessed works which follow him—to those high services as an author, and teacher, of which with deep thankfulness to God, we may to-day humbly endeavour to form some preliminary estimate.

1. The first of those services was the biography of his great and beloved master, Dr. Arnold. That book did more than anything, not only to perpetuate Arnold's memory, but (which he would have desired far more) to render permanent his work. How vast is the change which since 1827 has passed over English public schools! Many living men can remember the days of old, when the great French statesman said that the education which they furnished was the best there was,—and that it was execrable. The days, thank God, are past when Cowper's "Tirocinium," presented a true picture of our public schools; when but few masters sought for any close personal intercourse with their pupils, or dealt with them as immortal souls, or reminded them of the solemn professions of their baptism, or guided them into affectionate sympathy with their Church. The days are past when for English boys there were no hearty services, no special sermons, no stirring appeals; the days when a boy was met with a storm of ridicule if he dared to kneel by the altar of his own bedside,—when excess, and impurity, and ungodliness were rife, which a faithful message from God might have arrested as with a thunderclap. If all this be now changed—if the discipline be now more trustful, the sympathy closer, the religious influence unspeakably more intense,—who was it that inaugurated this deep and blessed change? One man more than all others, Dr. Thomas Arnold. He said of himself that he was "elected to Rugby to play a game in which the pawns were living creatures, and his adversary, the devil." Though he died early, he played it out and won. But it was owing in no small measure to his favourite pupil, Arthur Stanley, that his efforts shot a sympathetic thrill through English Schools. Others continued his work, but it was mainly through Stanley's Life of him that Arnold became magnetic, to flash as it were through all England the force of his own nobleness and his own conviction. And where had Stanley caught the flame? He himself has told us. It was in Rugby school-chapel—among those long lines of boyish faces—when through the darkening afternoons, the two lights of the simple pulpit shone out and not only delicate and beautiful souls received the impress, but even hardened boys were hushed with awe as that commanding form towered over them, and the kindling eye looked on them, and the strong voice rang like a clarion to array them in the cause of God. "Believe," said Dean Stanley years afterwards, preaching to a congregation of boys in the chapel of Marlborough College, "believe one who tells you from his own recollection, that if there be any time or place in which he may seem to have met the angels of God on his pilgrimage through life, it was in the midst of a congregation such as this. Years have now rolled away, yet that chapel, with its joyful and mournful

recollections, still remains a fair and blessed spot in his memory of the past. The words then heard return again and again with the freshness and vividness of yesterday, to cheer and enliven, to console and solemnise, the labours and the leisure, the joys and the sorrows, of many who will remember that scene as long as life shall last."

First, then, among "the works which follow him," let us record those inestimable services to sound learning and religious education, which for many a long year, we trust, shall help English boys to be not only "profitable members of the Church and commonwealth," but also "partakers hereafter of the immortal glory of the resurrection."

2. I pass from this topic to his services to Holy Writ. Here again, not one in ten thousand of those who often spoke of him so slightingly have rendered, or will ever render, one hundredth part of the services which he rendered to the Book of God. I think that most men who have written about him forget how great his work was; forget that the memory of it is almost obliterated in the very universality of its success. His services may be chiefly summed up in the words that, for myriads of readers, wherever the English language is spoken, he has done more than any man—I pause to weigh my words, and I repeat—more than any man—to make God's Book known; to make Scripture history real; to make the men and women of the sacred story live. The times are not so far distant when, to masses of readers, the interpretation of Scripture was a chaos of unreality. Gauge, if you can, what must have been the depth of that unreality which made religious critics indignant because the late Dean Milman in his "History of the Jews," had spoken of Abraham as "an Eastern sheykh." But the work which Dean Milman began when he was a Canon of Westminster, Dean Stanley carried out with a skill and a genius which has changed the entire aspect of Biblical literature. In his "Sinai and Palestine" the fascinating record of his first journey to the East, he made us so familiar with scenes of Scripture that we almost seem to have ourselves visited the land—

> Over whose acres walked those blessèd feet
> Which, eighteen hundred years ago, were nailed
> For our salvation to the bitter Cross.

We seem to sit with Abraham under the rustling boughs of the terebinth at Mamre; or to kneel with Paul and his weeping friends upon the rocks of Tyre. We seem to rest at the Lord's feet as He sat weary by the well of Jacob; or toil with Him up the rocky path of Nain! to listen to Him among the mountain lilies, or at His side to watch the birds which ruffle with their white wings the Lake of Galilee. And as in "Sinai and Palestine" he thus brought into vividness the scenes of Scripture, so, in his "Lectures on the Jewish Church," the men and women of the Bible started into life again, and breathed, and wept, and struggled, and rejoiced—not figures woven on faded tapestries, but men and women like ourselves. Among their green pastures the Patriarchs moved in peace. The Priests and Levites, in their solemn choirs, seemed once more to fill the Temple with the glory of song. The heroes blew the clarion of battle. Against wrong and robbery, against luxury and oppression, the Prophets hurled their words of fire. We saw the flash of Ehud's dagger, and Jael with the hammer in her hand, and Elijah, the "lord of hair," stand at the door of Naboth's vineyard before the cowering King. For the first time, to very many, the old, old story ceased to be the dead record of things but half believed; but, as on a mirror, there gleamed forth a history which taught us how in *all* history God deals with man. Never was a more unassailable barrier erected against the assaults of scepticism, than this resuscitation of the living truthfulness of the sacred history. It restored to us, in all their richness, the meaning of the warning of those old examples. Nor was this work done for the Old Testament alone. In his commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, in his "Sermons in the East," and in other books, he did similar work for the New Testament also. In his note on Patmos he helped to solve a most disputed problem of modern criticism, by showing how the scenery of that rocky isle, the sea by which it is surrounded, the burning mountain in the midst of the sea, which is visible from its shores, prove that the Apocalypse was indeed written there. Nor is it the least part of what he has done that henceforth his name will be written indelibly on the records of the Revised Version, of which, in almost his latest paper, he told the story with all his familiar comprehensiveness and charm.

3. Nor were his services to theology—to true theology—to that which he regarded, and which many of the best and wisest of men have regarded, as the highest and best theology—less striking. In the very last of his books, his "Christian Institutes," there might be much from which we differ, but what a flood of light he has thrown on the pure simplicity of early Christianity; with what a charm of genius and of gentleness has he tried to sever the essential truth from the accidental form! It was a favourite sneer of those who exult in the poor task of depreciation, that he was "no theologian." In one sense he would have rejoiced not to be so. There is theology and theology. A science of theology there is—a science at once divine and humble. But there is also a theology which ever tries to monopolise the name, and is no true theology, but is a thing of words and definitions. And for this spurious type of theology which throws no light on the love of God, and sheds no ray on the path of man, but has often been stained through and through with the deadliest stains of arrogance and superstition,—for that type of theology—the theology of the Scribes and Phari-

sees—he had no regard. Ignorant of it he was not; disdain it he did. *Pectus facit theologum*—It is the heart and not the head which makes the true theologian. To two men only in nineteen centuries has the Church granted the title of "the Theologian"—the one was St. John, the most loving of Apostles; the other was St. Gregory of Nazianzus, of all the Fathers the most liberal and the most human. Such a theologian, full of love and full of liberality—a theologian not, indeed, of a pedantic ecclesiasticism, but of a wisdom which is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and of good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy—was Arthur Stanley. But, as though this sneer were not enough, men have dared to say that he was "a sceptic." I know not whether such slanders deserve most of burning indignation or of unfathomable disdain. But, because there may be some who are too feeble to distinguish between the babble of party and the true voice of the Church of God, for their sakes I will record how, in almost his last articulate words, when he could scarcely speak for effort—when he was passing and knew that he was passing, into the presence of his Saviour and his God—with an emotion which none who were privileged to stand there will forget—he rallied the ebbing forces of life to bless the weeping mourners who were gathered around his bed in that sacred Benediction which from this very spot you have often heard him so solemnly pronounce; and he who at that blessed and solemn moment held his hand will never forget the deep pause, the earnest pressure of his hand, at each of the Sacred Names—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. And for the sake, again, of those who are too credulous to see the baseness of such calumnies, I will say this much more. It is now seventeen years ago since, preaching in St. Paul's Cathedral to candidates for ordination, he exclaimed, "We hear much in these days for and against dogmatic religion—positive and negative theology—definite and indefinite teaching. There may be those who may be called upon to increase or to diminish the stock of our existing doctrines; but for the vast mass, both of those who hear and of those who teach, what we most want is not more or less doctrine, but that we should understand the full meaning of the doctrines we already have. The familiar doctrines of the Church—the corruption of human nature, the Divine predestination, justification, the Atonement, the doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity—hold to each and all of these; but, as you use them, see what you mean by them; or if you cannot define them, be aware that you cannot do so. The silence of theology is often as instructive as its speech." So he spoke, and his meaning is clear. It is, Beware lest you too become, like Job's friends, liars for God; beware lest you be so false that you partly take yourself for true; beware lest your theology become a jarring noise of shiboleths, whose want of reality to you is weighted by anathemas against others; beware lest it become an excuse for base depreciations, used as a foil for pretentious boastfulness; but be above all things true before God; say exactly what you think: be exactly what you seem. "Have your loins girt about with truth—truth in action, truth in speech, truth in manner, truth in heart, truth in thought." And, immediately after this solemn appeal to truth, he said, "How can I express my conviction of the depths of new wisdom and endless instruction, to be learned from Jesus Christ—Christ crucified and Christ risen—Christ our example and our sacrifice—Christ our Prophet and our redeemer—Christ Who took our nature upon Him and Christ of one substance with the Father—Christ the Word of God, Christ the Light of the World—Christ the Way, Christ the Truth, Christ the Life—every one of these words and ideas has more in it than has ever been taken out of it—all make up the very truth of God, the very essence of Christianity in the strength of which, and in the strength of Him Whom they set forth, we may well defy the world, and repose in the true communion of saints." So he wrote in 1864. Is this scepticism? Is this Sadduceeism? The beautiful hymns he wrote on the Resurrection and the Ascension—hymns which breathe a holy fervour and a living faith in every line—are they scepticism? are they Sadduceeism? Oh! in the name of the God of Truth, is it a light thing, is it a venial crime, is it a trivial falsehood, to hint that such a man was an unbeliever? And when an aged and honoured London clergyman asked him, but very recently, whether he still held to those words, he—astonished perhaps at men's baseness, and the ready credulity given to party slander—answered with a repetition of that emphatic testimony—"Certainly, I would say every one of those words now." Of course he would. Why, almost the last words which fell upon his conscious ear were the words of the hymn which had hung for years in his bedroom before his waking eyes:—

> How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
> In a believer's ear.

And oh, if, in their happy state, the spirits of the blessed dead can hear,—if they linger in the places which they loved of old,—I trust that he will pardon me if such falsehoods can move me—if they have power to stir the passion of one who honoured him as a father, who loved him as a friend—and if I say to those who, in the name of what they call religion, thus shamefully sin against God's Ninth Commandment:—

> Blush, Calumny! and write upon his tomb,
> If honest eulogy will leave thee room,
> Thy deep repentance of thy thousand lies
> Which, aimed at him, have pierced the offended skies,
> And say, Blot out my sin, confessed, deplored,
> Against Thine image in Thy saint, O Lord!

4. I turn to happier and brighter topics. Who shall rightly estimate the Dean's unparalleled

services to this great Abbey? Round Westminster Abbey his thoughts centred; to it he alluded, in almost his last articulate words as we took them down verbally and unaltered from his failing speech: "The end has come," he said, "in the way I most desired it should come. I could not have controlled it better. After preaching one of my sermons on the Beatitudes, I had a most violent fit of sickness, took to my bed, and said immediately that I wished to die at Westminster." "I am perfectly happy; perfectly satisfied; I have no misgivings." And again, a little later on—"So far as I knew what the duties of this office are supposed to be, in spite of every incompetence, I yet humbly trust that I have sustained, before the mind of the nation, the extraordinary value of the Abbey as a religious, liberal, and national institution." Ah! the great heart of the English people, uncorroded by narrow bitterness, will do him justice! If as a recent writer said, the haunting influence of the Abbey can be traced in all the sermons of those who serve it, to whom is this due? Within living memory the Canons of the Abbey hardly knew one tomb from another. Who is it that has made us familiar with every stone? who has made every corner of it vocal with the memories of the great and good? Who has made it like an epic poem carved in immortal sculpture? Who chose the mottoes, so rich in meaning and beauty, which make such graves or monuments as those of Wesley, and Livingstone, and Peabody, and Lawrence speak to every casual wanderer nobler lessons than the Hermæ of old to the Athenian populace? Who spent his money upon the Abbey with princely and often unnoticed munificence? Who provided the splendid oratorios which, from year to year, thronged it from end to end? Who was it who, week by week, led round it large companies of working men and entertained them afterwards—so that, under the very windows where he lay a-dying, last Saturday week, seventy working men who had just been shown its marvels, were being entertained, as they weekly were, at his expense? And which of you has not heard those exquisite sermons of his, of which we shall never hear the like again—so pure in style, so fascinating in their charm, so rich in illustrative anecdote, so large in Catholicity, so full of charity and truth and tenderness, so bright with the sunshine of an exquisite fancy? Who does not remember how, when some great man died—were it a musician like Sir Sterndale Bennett, or an architect like Sir Gilbert Scott, or statesman like Lord Beaconsfield, or great Proconsul like Lord Lawrence, or great writer like Dickens or Carlyle—the Dean embalmed his memory with a grace, a pathos, and a knowledge which could have been shed on it by no living man? And, oh, to think that we shall never hear him read again, with such ringing exultation, the song of Deborah; or see the multitudes of little children hanging upon his lips on Innocents' day, while sometimes with the tears streaming down his face, he told them some sweet or pathetic tale! May we not say, as we glance around the ecclesiastics of to-day, "Howl, fir-trees, for the cedar is fallen"?—He is gone; and I fear we shall never look upon his like again.

5. For behind the poet, and the preacher, and the theologian, and the brilliant ornament of society—behind all his gifts and accomplishments, stood the dear, beloved man—beloved quite apart from all his greatness, who would have been beloved for the beauty of his character, even if the world had never known his name. Again and again, as I think of him, I recall the Beatitudes on which were spoken his last words. I think of the best and noblest buried in this Abbey: I think of Sir Isaac Newton, of whom men said that he was the whitest soul they had ever known. I think of Addison, whom he chose to illustrate the "pure in heart." Even to have known him was a liberal education. In whom shall we see again the playful wit which so thoroughly enjoyed itself; the sweetness of childhood taken up into the powers of manhood; the young lamb's heart amid the full-grown flocks; the rare mixture of intrepid courage with childlike simplicity; the boundless popularity which yet so scorned every art by which popularity is won? In whom else can we find that exquisite, humble geniality, which made him easier of access than any great man of his day; that potent charm which was to many of us the very poetry and sweetness of our life here? And, oh, to see how he rose against opposition, with a chivalry worthy of his name! Was a man friendless; was he unpopular; was he assailed with ungenerous opposition? While the mass of us were ready in "the eternal spirit of the populace" to hound him down, to let a single error outweigh the faithfulness of a life, to join in the hiss of the serpent, whether social or ecclesiastical—if a man had but erred (or not erred) from love of truth, that was enough reason for Arthur Stanley—peaceful as he was by nature—to spring into the forefront of the battle and to throw over the oppressed the shield of his high rank and stainless reputation. At such times the temper, which was as gentle naturally as the wind upon the violet, became like the breeze among the mountain pines. I have seen him stand up alone, before a crowded meeting, amid stinging criticisms and the rudest uproar, to face the blind outcry against unpopular men. His spirits seemed to dilate as he stood up for charity and tolerance against the bitterness of theological dislike. But why need I speak of him to you? We who belong to this place know in our sad hearts all that we have lost? We know how much poorer all life is to us. We shall never forget his genial and charming gaiety at the choir suppers. You boys of Westminster School know how kind he was to many of you. There was not a verger, there was not a little boy

in the choir, to whom he was not kind. An eminent dignitary, writing from Pembroke Docks, told me that even in that far-off place he heard the working men in the streets speaking of him with sorrow, and saying, "He was such a good man." And one who here, at Westminster, had experienced as a child his nameless little gracious acts of kindness, wrote of him with childlike simplicity, "I think that heaven itself must be happier, if that be possible, because the Dean is there."

Alas! the eloquent tongue is silent; the kind heart has ceased to beat! That gracious and gentle figure will be seen no more amid the heat and whirl and vulgarity of our dusty and noisy life. Men of other days will envy us the blessing of having lived familiarly with so much sweetness and goodness. When rancour offends us—when we watch with dismay the puff and push of a struggling meanness—when life looks like "a waste for the greater and the lesser greeds to war upon," we shall think sometimes of his patience and of his goodness, and be refreshed. To have lost a blessing is more blessed than not to have had it. We have lost the happy reality; we cannot lose the dear memory. And as for him, he has gone from our envies, and hatreds and religious spites, "to where, beyond these voices, there is peace." If we could, we love him too dearly to call him back again. But three weeks ago he said in this pulpit—"As the hart panteth after the water-brooks,—this is the true likeness of hungering and thirsting after righteousness. When we toil towards the close of our earthly course, or of any special period of it; when we feel stifled by the sultry and suffocating sense of the hardness and selfishness of the world around us; when our breath is, as it were, choked by the dust and trifles of the forms and passions of the world we live in, or by the endless clattering whirl of its vast machinery, we may well join in the cry, 'I thirst for the sight of any pure, generous, upright spirit; I thirst for the day when I may drink freely of God's boundless charity; I thirst for the day when I shall hear the sound of abundance of rain from a higher heaven than that which now encloses us around.'" Thank God! for him now that thirst is quenched. He is with the spirits of just men made perfect. He is in the unclouded sunshine of God's love. He shared—as almost every good man has done—he shared to the full the beatitude of malediction here, and "feeble hands iniquitously just" may continue it—thinking that they do God service by slandering His saints. But the great deep heart of England and of America, is moved for him in every class to-day as it would be for scarce another living man; and the career which they call "melancholy" has been crowned now with the Voice which utters to a good man after death, "Servant of God, well done!" Alas! not the half has been expressed; but as one who cannot reach to place his garland on the brow of a statue lays it humbly on the pedestal beside its feet, so with a weak but loving hand I do to-day—

Ponitur hic imos ante corona pedes.

He will rest among proud names—kings and warriors and patriots—

> Just men, by whom impartial laws were given,
> And saints, who taught and led the way to heaven.

But we may say of him, in the words carved upon the grave of the great and gentle writer, who will not lie far from him, and whose memory he loved, because he was of a spirit kindred with his own:—

> Ne'er to these chambers, where the mighty rest,
> Since their foundation came a nobler guest,
> Nor e'er was to the bowers of bliss conveyed
> A fairer spirit, or more welcome shade.

DELIVERANCE FROM BONDAGE AND DEATH.

By the Rev. THOMAS BATES, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Balham, S.W., late Theol. Exhibitioner in the University of Durham.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday Evening, Sept. 18th, 1881.

"Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captive delivered? But thus saith the Lord, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered: for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children."—Isaiah xlix. 24, 25.

THE Messianic Prophet, as he gazes upon his people sunk in misery, because the prey of a mighty tyrant, the Devil! sunk in bondage, because the slaves of a terrible master, Death! asks with incredulity, "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captive delivered?"—it seems almost an impossible thing to him, so deep were they sunk. But the answer he is bidden to hear tells of a deliverance full and free! "Thus saith the Lord, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered: for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children."

My brethren, the state of fallen man is one of misery and bondage.

1. Misery because he is the prey of a mighty tyrant, the Devil.

2. Bondage because he is the slave of a terrible master, Death.

Look for a moment at the picture of a man who is the slave of some besetting sin—how he loathes the sin, yet can't get free from it! Every circumstance seems to help forward his sin—he finds himself always bound by it, tries to throw it off, and all goes wrong; back it comes again and again. "Impossible!" whispers the Devil; "what is the use of your trying? You can't get free." Oh the misery of such a soul! Anywhere to escape from it! But no; self goes along with him; sin dogs his steps wherever he goes. The Mighty One has

possession! The strong man armed keepeth the palace! Well may we ask with incredulity, "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captive delivered?" There are some so steeped in sin that we deem it almost impossible that they should be saved. But now listen to the answer: "Thus saith the Lord, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered; for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children." I see One coming in time clothed with humility. The Incarnate Son of God. The "stronger than he."

Let us stand for a moment and watch our David go forth to the conflict. It is a garden; the shadows of night have enveloped the earth; the Paschal moon sheds her pale light, throwing deep shadows of the olive trees upon the ground. I see Jesus—Jesus who has spent thirty-three years in going about doing good! Jesus who has never committed a single sin! but oh! my brethren, there is a strange horror depicted upon His face, an awful sadness. He is prostrate upon the ground, wet with dew; I hear strange, sad words issuing from His sacred lips—"Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from Me." And look! from His sacred brow comes a bloody sweat. Again He prays, with agonizing earnestness, "My Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from Me." Once more come with me in thought to a scene still more awful. I see on yonder hill of Calvary three crosses erected. Two thieves, and Jesus between them! I hear the scoffs and jeers of the surging crowd, I gaze up into the face of Jesus, so marred, so blurred and blotted by His own blood. But listen! what is that cry?—"My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Ah, my brethren! I ask you to drink in this vision, for it most intimately concerns us. What is to account for the agony and loud cry upon the cross? Is it Satan is buffeting our Blessed Lord, knowing that he has but a short time?—perhaps so; but that does not altogether account for His agony. Is it that He feels the shame?—there is He, the Holy One, pure from stain of sin, between two thieves. Is it fear of death? No; for death was to Him the return to glory, it was the restoration to brightness. Oh, my brethren, we never can know, here, all the depth of the sorrow of Jesus. But we do know that in a very real manner "He contended with him that contendeth with us." He bore upon His sacred heart the sin of the whole world! Your sin, brothers, and mine! and it broke His heart. Oh love how great! It broke His heart.

But yet further. Not only does our Captain contend with our foe, delivering us from the misery and bondage of sin; but see! He comes forth from death holding in His hands the keys of Hell and of Death. Oh, glorious Gospel news, the prey is delivered. Henceforth, in union with a risen Lord, we can get free from sin's cruel thraldom. "Now I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." By the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ man is delivered from the guilt and power of sin. O brothers! why tarry we down here, why go on your way with dejected countenance? Look up! "Because I live ye shall live also." "I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore." Rejoice, O captive, thou art free! for Satan is vanquished. Think you that those countrymen of ours, shut up in Lucknow, enduring the protracted suspense, waiting for relief, sometimes cast down to despair, then full of hope—think you they hailed Havelock's approach with calm serenity? No. Methinks a shout cleaved the sky, as they saw the welcome deliverer approach, that made heaven's arches ring again. And oh, brothers! the freedom Jesus has effected for us is grander far than that of Lucknow's captives. Shout, then, for joy, ye blood-bought sons of God; for "If the Son shall make you free, ye are free indeed."

But not only does Christ deliver the prey from the hand of the mighty, but, my brethren, by His death He has destroyed death, and by His rising again He has brought life and immortality to light." He delivers the captive from the hand of the terrible one, Death!

I see a rider on a pale horse, he stops here, and the loved child is gone; there, and the mother is no more; here, and the husband is taken away. Oh yes; we know thee, O Death! thou art a terrible one! Why, my brethren, in looking around any congregation, do we find the prevailing colour black? Is it not a sign that man is the slave of a terrible one? Ah! we all look for him. He is a merciless tyrant: it may be the sole joy and support of the widow's home, but he spares not at the widow's tears. Many of us tremble as we think of him, fearful lest he should call upon us. Oh, how we long to be free from his tyranny. Not very long ago a rich merchant, who had bought a large estate, and had furnished his mansion and laid out his grounds in perfect taste, fell sick, and when the physicians were called in and pronounced his disease incurable, it was as gently as possible broken to him that he must die. Making a supreme effort he raised himself up in his bed, and, pointing to the window, he bade his friends see all his beautiful estate, his richly furnished room. "I can't leave all this; I won't die!" And, lifting up his voice, he cried aloud, "I won't die!" then sank back upon his pillow a corpse! My brethren, we are often met by the irreligious with the excuse, "I must live; I have no time for your religion, I must live." There is a truth that is even truer than this excuse, "You must die! You must die!"

But I see another rider. His form is like the Son of God. He rides along the ages, bearing in His hands a release. Oh! it is Jesus! The risen Jesus. He cries, "'O Death, I will be thy plague; O Grave, I will be thy destruction.' Go free ye captives ones; go free! Fear not death! for it is

but the gateway of life! I am thy Saviour—saving thee from the guilt and power of sin. I am thy Redeemer, buying thee back from the hands of death. I am the Mighty One, conquering and to conquer!"

Death lands me but in glory. Here, at best, my service is but dull and dreary; but there, every faculty shall find full satisfaction; there my intellect shall develop with divine fulness. "Here in the body pent" my worship of Thee is but limited; my corruptible body presses down the incorruptible soul. But there! body and soul united in glory shall serve God with perfect liberty. Oh glorious day! when around the Throne and before the Lamb, Redeemed man shall offer his highest, best worship. Welcome, death! since thou dost but give me freedom! And Jesus is passed on before me, lighting up its darksome path!

My brethren, if there are any here who cannot appreciate this thought of death, let me proclaim to you to-night the glorious Gospel news." Jesus stands before each heart to-night and cries, "I am He that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of Hell and of Death." Rise from the death of sin to the new life of righteousness. But how shall I rise? By the power of the Living Jesus.

My brethren, all the preciousness of Jesus Christ lies in His ability to minister to the felt needs of our spiritual nature. He draws us to Himself, because in Him the spiritual needs of poor fallen humanity find their satisfaction. The created heart of man can only find its rest in the uncreated heart of God. And the sense of alienation from God through the power of indwelling sin, leaves us in an agony of moral bondage. Even the most degraded sinner has some faint aspiration after the good and the true. And those who are trying most to follow that which is holy, are all too conscious of innate weakness. Like St. Paul, they are fain to cry out from time to time, "The good that I would I do not: but the evil that I would not, that I do." Oh, my brethren, there is a hell—however fashionable it may be to ignore its existence—there is a hell upon earth, when bound by the chains of a weak will, day by day conscious of the evil, we yet day by day continue in its slavery.

Men do live in moral bondage, hating the evil, and yet powerless to resist it. Now Jesus Christ meets us, agonizing and praying—meets us as the Great Emancipator of the human will. What is necessary to live a God-like life (for this, my brothers, is our felt need)? We must possess a God-like strength—must possess a communicated life of God. In Eden the life was a God-given life of original righteousness. By sin this original righteousness was lost; man became powerless, his whole moral nature falling into bondage. For what, my brethren, is sin, but the gratification of God-given desires in a God-forbidden way? And this lost control of the passions is recovered to us in Christ Jesus. He ever lives on high to minister gifts of Grace to us. Grace is a real, tangible thing: it is the life of God, communicated to the soul of man. Jesus Christ meets Satan, and in His resistance shows us how to resist. Jesus Christ dies, and in His death conquers death for us. Jesus Christ lives, and living, offers to each soul Eternal Life! Himself God, therefore able; Himself man, and therefore willing. Oh, brothers, claim this Grace He so freely gives. But you may ask, How does this Grace flow to man? How did life flow to us? from Adam. God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and then out of his side he took Eve—from whom the whole world was peopled. And as with the first Adam, so with the second. Jesus sleeps on Calvary, and forth from that pierced side, pierced by a Gentile, flows the rich stream of Grace-giving Sacraments—Water to cleanse, Blood to redeem. And these rich channels of His Grace, flowing on from age to age through the Catholic Church, have been, and still are, to multitudes, the means of giving that supernatural power, without which the soul is helpless. True, Grace must be received intelligently, not merely mechanically. The sacramental channels are only the means whereby we receive. Faith—not in the Sacrament, but in Jesus; not in It, but in Him; not in the thing, but in the Person—is the link. Here is Christ's answer to the Prophet's question; here, dear souls, does Jesus give comfort to each one of us. Jesus can set us free, for He has conquered; and for more than eighteen hundred years Jesus has been the Great Emancipator of men. In Him weak wills become strong. He fills cold hearts with love. Why linger still in sin? Come forth! Here, to-night, at the foot of His Cross, lay down your poor, sin-laden souls, and go forth free! Free with the glorious freedom of the Sons of God.

Her Majesty has given a second donation of £100 to the Hampshire Diocesan Society, which is the chief promoter and helper of spiritual agencies in poor and populous parishes, of church buildings, and Church of England education in the county.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has, upon the recommendation of the Bishop of St. Albans, conferred the Degree of Doctor of Divinity on the Rev. Ethelbert William Bullinger, vicar of St. Stephen's, Walthamstow, Essex, in recognition of his eminent services in the Church in the department of Biblical criticism.

A short time since the new vicar of Greenwich, the Rev. Brooke Lambert, sent circulars to the members of the congregation respecting the proposal to vest the choir in surplices, the replies in favour of which were in the majority. It is now proposed to remove the old carved pulpit and the stained-glass window over the Communion-table, presented to the church some quarter of a century ago by the then churchwarden, Mr. Edward Lambert, to make room for choir stalls.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160. Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1881.

OUR esteemed correspondent "An Irishwoman," cannot have read "Clk.'s" letter aright or she would have seen that he suggests well-regulated Polygamy as a punishment and deterrent for incontinence. It would certainly be severe and probably effective as a deterrent. We challenge our correspondent to prove that Polygamy is opposed to the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, except in the case of Bishops, Elders, and Deacons, "whose moderation is to be known unto all men." Assuming Polygamy not to be unlawful and displeasing to God, the question is whether its attendant evils to either sex or to the children are greater than those of rampant prostitution and its attendant diseases. We believe it would be an effectual and radical cure for the social evil; for, having resided for a lengthened period in Asiatic Turkey, we can testify to its freedom alike from prostitution and syphilitic diseases. The health, strength, and bodily happiness of the Turk is proverbial, and he is a very religious, God-fearing, and moral man, who treats women with great respect and kindness. The Polygamy is in this case well-regulated by the Mohammedan law, and is only indulged in by comparatively rich men. Its hardships on women are somewhat exaggerated by "An Irishwoman," who, if she were to read the Koran, or the Travels of any trustworthy lady, would know that Mormonism is a very different thing from a well-regulated Polygamy. But compulsory Polygamy is as yet outside the range of practical politics; and compulsory castration as suggested by "A. Z." is still further off, however *Christian* it may be. If they were practicable we should regard Polygamists and *evirati*, as well as monks and nuns, as monstrosities of bygone and unenlightened civilisations. We trust that women, who have great power in this matter, will help us to suppress at least street prostitution, and to prevent a contagion which is the source of immorality as also of death and disease. With this view we confidently ask their support of the Contagious Diseases Acts. Mr. Lynn controverts our statements with reference to the good effected by this legislation. As to medical opinion in their favour, we believe every medical journal advocates them, and nearly, if not quite all, the medical men in the subjected towns have petitioned in their favour; in London, in 1872, 2,500 signatures of the most eminent practitioners were obtained in a few hours. Medical opinion may have changed since then, but we cannot admit as conclusive evidence of such change the opinion of small meetings packed by repeal agitators, as seems to have been the case at the meetings referred to by Mr. Lynn, for the *Lancet* reports one of them as follows:—

The subject for discussion on the 8th inst. was the Influence of the Contagious Diseases Acts on the Prevalence of the Venereal Affections among the Troops serving in the United Kingdom. The subject was dealt with chiefly from a statistical point of view. The paper on the subject was read by one so distinguished in statistics as Inspector-General Robert Lawson, and, as on all other occasions, the vast benefit of the Contagious Diseases Act, not only on the prevalence of all forms of venereal disease among the troops, but also among the civil population of the stations where the troops have been quartered, was abundantly proved. Thus, in comparing fourteen stations under the Acts and fourteen not under the Acts during the periods 1861-66 and 1867-72, a marked diminution of the number of admissions in the latter period of six years, when the Act was in full force. Surgeon Myers, of the Coldstream Guards, in addition gave his results from an examination of the subject from small figures. The Guards stationed at Windsor formerly suffered immensely from syphilis. Immediately on the introduction of the Act at Windsor diminution set in, and the Guards are practically without syphilis at Windsor. No corresponding diminution has occurred amongst the Guards stationed in London, where the Act is not in force. Surgeon-Generals Mouat, V.C., Gordon, and Röth, of the 4th German Army Corps, abundantly testified to the overwhelming benefit of the Acts, Surgeon-General Röth stating, in addition, that the one thing German scientific men could not understand was that there should be any discussion at all on the subject. It is needless, of course, to say that this conclusive reasoning did not silence that obtrusive clique who persistently repeat incorrect assertions, which they vainly imagine are arguments, for the repeal of the Act. Worsted in debate, all they could do was to calumniate the officers of the Army Medical Department, and in such a manner as to call forth from Professor Longmore and Surgeon-General Röth a dignified and scathing rebuke.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

SIR,—You have fully answered all the so-called moral objections to these Acts. With your permission I will endeavour to show how very widespread these diseases are amongst innocent persons.

Writing in 1867, Sir James Paget says:—"For illustration of the mischief that syphilis may do, I would adduce instances of medical men who have contracted the disease in performing their professional duties. I have seen at least five surgeons, in active practice, and in good health previous to inoculating this disease on their fingers, who have died; some

after months, others after years of illness. And I must have seen at least fifty who, through similar inoculation, have suffered more or less severely before they recovered health." In an address delivered before the Epidemiological Society a year previously, Sir William Jenner said :—"The frequency of cases of liver disease, of so-called consumption, of kidney disease, and of brain disease which are referable directly to syphilis, and of cases of so-called scrofulous diseases in the child that are also due to inherited syphilis, becomes daily more apparent. Syphilis, more often than has commonly been believed, means death —death to the contractor of the disease, death to his offspring. . . . If every young man curbed his passions, syphilis might die out. Let teachers of morality and religion endeavour to impress on young men and lads, especially on the latter, the necessity for exercising this restraint. But until they have succeeded in their teaching, it is the duty of authority to prevent, as it could to a great extent, the spread of this terrible disease. The spread of knowledge, and the influence of Society can do almost nothing; moral teaching can do something; but law could do much to diminish the mortality from syphilis. It could prevent the prostitute from plying her trade in the public thoroughfares, and thus keep temptation to some extent out of the way of the merely irresolute and thoughtless ; it is a disgrace to authority that it does not frame and put in force such a law. Again, law could check to a great extent the wide diffusion of syphilis. A little has been done in this direction, more is being attempted." Dr. Arthur Farre, in his evidence before the Special Committee, 1864, said :—"During the time—twenty-one years—I was physician at King's College Hospital, where there was a special department for children, the number of patients that passed through my hands was about eighty thousand, chiefly children, but many women. . . . Amongst these children examples of syphilis were so common that I was nearly always able to give a lecture on half-a-dozen cases in a morning, on any of the three days of the week that I attended there." Dr. Robert Barnes, in a letter written about twelve years ago, said :—"It is impossible to estimate accurately the extent of the injury inflicted upon society by the insidious spread of the syphilitic poison. But every observant medical practitioner has abundant proofs that this injury is widespread and deplorable. In all classes, infants and children, virtuous women—especially mothers—suffer from this disease, or from some of its more remote consequences. Not only do innocent persons thus suffer individually, but society is deeply concerned by the degradation of health, and the necessity for maintaining a large proportion of its members in infirmity—castaway, debased from the ranks of active and healthy humanity, scrofulous, insane, or idiotic. . . . To me it seems a paramount duty to guard virtuous women and innocent children from the remote but certain and dire effects of the acts of others, which can only be done by secluding persons afflicted with contagious disease, so long as they are liable to communicate it to others." Sir Thomas Watson, speaking at a public meeting in St. James's Hall, 1868, said :—"Steps should be taken to restrain a disease which counts its victims, not only among the vicious and self-indulgent, but among virtuous women and innocent children, by hundreds of thousands." The Royal Commissioners of 1870 did not lose sight of this question, for in par. 64 of their Report they say :—"We attach great importance to the maintenance of a system which, if it cannot altogether annul, may at least materially mitigate, a pestilence which is not like other contagions, of occasional occurrence, but one of perennial growth. The offenders who bring this affliction upon themselves by their own vicious indulgence may have no claim to the compassionate care of the State, but the numerous innocent persons who suffer from the disease are surely entitled to consideration. We venture to express our hope, therefore, that while due consideration is paid to the sentiments of the people in regard to prostitution, no misapprehension as to the real moral bearings of the question, and no want of courage, will be suffered to prevent the application of such remedy as may be practicable to this great evil. The firmness of a former Parliament withstood the storm of clamour with which the discovery of vaccination was assailed by the ignorance and prejudice of the day, and relieved posterity from a scourge which was the terror of earlier generations; and we would fain hope that an attempt to stay the progress of a plague scarcely less formidable in its ravages is not to be hastily abandoned."

Three years ago a young woman who was nurse in a solicitor's family, was discovered by her mistress to have a rash. She was sent to me, and I found her suffering from syphilis in a very severe form. Her account was that she had been seduced by a soldier, but inquiries revealed that she was a thoroughly abandoned character. It is nothing short of a miracle that she did not infect her mistress's children.

Two years ago I was requested to see a married woman, who was in the last stage of this terrible disease. Her husband, a sailor, had the disease mildly some time before his marriage, and believed himself cured. But it was not so; he infected the poor woman, who after much suffering died, an object shocking to behold. Quite recently a local surgeon died of the disease, caused by inoculating his finger from a woman suffering from this disease. As he had suffered most intensely for eight years, his death was really a happy release. Two other surgeons of my acquaintance and a most respectable midwife have also suffered severely from contracting the disease while in the discharge of their professional duties; and the number of innocent persons I have attended within the last thirteen years for these maladies is legion.

Now the Ministers who introduced these Acts had their attention strongly drawn to the fact that our soldiers and sailors suffered more from these diseases than any other, and that these were the cause of much invaliding, amounting to as much as the loss of an entire regiment of soldiers, or the whole crew of an ironclad daily. These diseases were caused by the women, who always crowd round soldiers' and sailors' quarters, going to the men rather than the men going to them, and being mostly mere masses of rottenness and vehicles of disease. It was to prevent this that the Acts were passed, and as has been proved conclusively, they have been most successful. It is not, as some of your correspondents assert, a question of statement against statement, or figures *versus* figures, but one of facts. It is a fact beyond controversy that troops stationed in places protected by the Acts have not one-half the amount of disease as those stationed in London and other unprotected places. It is a fact that the crews of ironclads stationed in a protected port have much fewer cases of disease than in an unprotected one. It is a fact, and in a pecuniary sense to them a very painful fact, that in protected places the incomes of local medical men and chemists

have diminished considerably, from the circumstance that they attend much fewer cases of venereal disease than before the Acts were in force. It is a fact that the deaths from syphilis are fewer in those counties where the Acts are in force than in those where they are not. Facts are stubborn things.

Now these diseases, which we have seen are so hurtful to many innocent persons, are almost entirely traceable to common prostitutes. Hence the demand for extending these Acts and their most beneficial provisions. This would entail, Sir, a great loss to me and to many of my brethren, some loss to all. But honesty is the best policy, and I am proud of the fact, that with the exception of a few who wish to earn a little cheap notoriety by differing from the great majority of their brethren, and a few more who resemble "E. T." in his want of logical reasoning power, the whole of the medical profession are in favour of these Acts. Our position is even more impregnable than that of "E. T." It is our duty to administer relief to our suffering fellow-creatures, whether the suffering be due to their own misconduct or not. It is our duty to cure the diseased prostitute, even again and again, in the spirit of that charity which being past believing in and past hoping for, reformation still endureth all things. And it may not be out of place in the "CHURCH PULPIT," to point out (as none of your clerical correspondents have done) that in so doing we are following, though at a most awfully respectful distance, the example of Him Who went about healing "all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people," and Who said of the woman who was a sinner, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven."

26th September, 1881. A SURGEON.

SIR,—On page 119 of your issue under date September 3rd, you appear to rely upon the extent of medical opinion in favour of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and you assert that it "comprises more than 99 per cent. of the medical profession."

I have conversed on this subject with a very large number of medical men in numerous towns and cities in the West, South, and East, and in some of the Midland Counties of England, and do not find this to be the case at all. At the recent International Medical Congress two sittings were given to this subject. In the former, a morning sitting of the "State Medicine Department," no English surgeon defended the Acts. The speakers were gentlemen well known, and of repute in the profession both at home and abroad. Ten opposed the Acts and three defended them. In the latter, a morning sitting of the "Section of Military Surgery and Medicine," the proportions of the speakers were three against the Acts to two in favour of them. The demonstrations of approval and of agreement with which the opponents of the Acts were greeted, were very hearty, frequent, and widespread. I venture to submit, and am ready to support the position, that a very small minority of the profession are really acquainted with this subject; but will not intrude on your valuable space the details necessary to show on what grounds the supposed pro-Acts opinion of so many of the profession rests.

But this is not a question of medical opinion, but, *of great moral principles and of real sanitary science*, between which there cannot in the nature of things be the slightest possible discord.

My contention is that these Acts are in direct antagonism with moral principles and with the Word of God, but as others have written on this line already I will confine myself to the statement of the following facts as suggestive of the truth that these Acts are neither sanitary nor scientific.

Firstly.—Constitutional disease, the dangerous form which becomes hereditary, was diminishing in the Army prior to the Acts, and had fallen from 1859 (the earliest year of published and continuous official returns) to the year of the introduction of the Act more than 30 per cent.; of course without the Acts. The Royal Commission reported five years later that the Acts had not been proven to have reduced disease. Since this report this form of disease has always been higher, and, according to the latest published Army Medical Report, it is more than 17 per cent. higher than when the Act was introduced. This applies to the whole Home Army, five-eighths of which is under the so-called protection of the Acts.

Secondly.—The less serious form of disease, on which pro-Acts advocates rely for proof of the benefit of the Acts, as shown in the tables of the Blue Books, was reducing, in the districts ultimately put under the Acts, and before the introduction of any such measure, at the rate of 9·6 per cent. per annum; but since the new system has been fully applied, the reduction has been only 2 6 per cent. per annum.

Thirdly.—The characteristic history of the course of disease in the other districts has not changed throughout the entire period to which reference is made above.

Fourthly. — Disease amongst registered women under the Acts, according to the last published Police Report (1880), has increased every year for the last six years, and was higher in 1880 than in any year since 1869. (See col. 31, p. 5, of the last Annual Report.)

Your expression, "the existing most successful Acts," appears to depend upon the hypothetical unanimity of the professional opinion in their favour, but the above facts under both heads speak for themselves.

Doubtless tenacious advocates will say that you may prove anything by statistics. To this I would say in anticipation that such a demur applies only to arithmetical tricks, and not in any sense to truly scientific statistical statements or deductions.

I shall be happy to reply privately or in your columns to any of your correspondents, "A Surgeon" especially, should they favour me with queries, or to discuss privately or publicly this most terribly important subject with any gentleman, professional or otherwise; being earnestly desirous for "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

JOHN HUNT LYNN.

5, Osborne Road, Forest Gate, Essex,
September 20th, 1881.

SIR,—Matters have come to a strange climax when Polygamy is advocated by a minister of the Church. There is no comparison whatever between Mr. Voysey and the writer "Clk." The former teaches the most essential and sublime tenets of the Christian philosophy or "code of morals;" and is infinitely more Christian than "Clk.", who has truly no pretensions to Christianity at all, for he *practically* denies the inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures when he urges anything so opposed to the teaching of Christ and His Apostles as Polygamy. Polygamy degrades women to the level of a beast; there can be no love in the question when two or a dozen wives are maintained—

as the case may be—merely for the gratification of what is gross and bestial. Women would then be slaves: they would no longer have any pretensions to social equality with men. Happily the system would not be feasible to any great extent, as most men find it difficult enough to support *one* wife. There is a book on "Mormonism," by Mrs. Raddock, about to be published, which it would be well for those to read who are unaware of the degradation and suffering Polygamy brings on women. I quote from an American writer—as nearly as I can from memory—who, alluding to Mormonism, says:—"It is the most rotten, sensual, and degraded system, socially and religiously, that ever existed on earth. It is death to the hearts and hopes of women, destroying, as it does, the pure ties of home. With an outward form of religion, it is within full of dead men's bones and reeking stenches." It is men who really are the main cause of the evils we deplore, *not* women; to punish pure and innocent women because of *their* failing is too obviously unjust to require explanation. Polygamy has ever been the custom with barbaric peoples. It is regarded by Moralists and Christians of the civilized world as an odious form of legalized incontinence. Vast numbers of men do and will abide by Monogamy; but the most effectual way of corrupting them and dragging them down from their "holy estate," is to institute Polygamy.

The "Latter-Day *Saints*" sin incomparably more, and are more culpable, than "those under the law of Moses," for thousands of years have rolled between, and have borne with them progress and civilization. Your correspondent would turn back the dial-plate of Time to the ages of primitive barbarism.

AN IRISHWOMAN.

SIR,—"Clk.'s" suggestion, even if considered lawful, would in a great degree be ineffectual; because prostitution is chiefly caused by the passions of those men who are not in a position to marry.

I conceive the following to be a better suggestion:—

I. Let all restrictions on marriage among soldiers and police be at once removed; they are incentives to evil.

II. Let any man known to have had intercourse with a prostitute or any woman except his wife be castrated.

III. Let young men be taught to regard castration as a means of doing away with their passion if they find it ungovernable.

Would this be wrong? a hindrance to "the survival of the fittest," or *unchristian?* That *all* men cannot live in unmarried purity seems asserted by our Lord in Matt. xix. 11. That castration is not unchristian seems to me to be implied in Matt. xix. 12. That it may be voluntarily undergone, and should be encouraged in some cases seems implied by the spirit of Matt. v. verse 30. Would not these suggestions if encouraged by teachers of morality do much to diminish prostitution and misery? A. Z.

SIR,—I have read with interest the correspondence on this unsavoury subject, and often wished to put in a word now and then: I refrained only because I thought the case was in better hands than mine. When, however, "Clk." has the courage to come forward and openly recommend Polygamy as a cure for the social evil, it is time for some one to recall your correspondents and readers to the first principles by which human beings ought to be guided in this most solemn matter of the relation of the sexes.

First, what does mere Nature teach in reference to Polygamy and Polyandry respectively? For a merely animal existence, Nature has not a word to say against Polygamy, which is free from penal consequences alike in the dumb animals and in man. But upon Polyandry (a euphemism for fornication) Nature has pronounced her curse. It is uniformly visited with dire consequences, even to the third and fourth and fortieth generation that may unfortunately inherit the taint of blood. For Polyandry there can be no immunity and only a very slight amelioration. Your Contagious Diseases Acts, well-meant and to a certain degree protective, are nevertheless powerless to effect an escape from Nature's ban. Now comes the alternative of Polygamy. If men were only beasts of the field it would be all right. But in the case of human beings, Polygamy has been tried on a wide scale, and proved to be diametrically opposed to man's welfare as a moral and social being. It simply destroys the best and most refined part of family life, and thus does unspeakable mischief to the children. I say nothing of the excessive culture of the sexual passions, but I insist only on the moral, domestic, and therefore social, mischief inflicted by Polygamy, and for which alone it has been denounced and abandoned by the highest portion of the human race. [Bible readers, of whom I suppose "Clk." is one, might learn a hint or two about the evils of Polygamy from the several histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.]

Here, then, we stand. Polyandry is forbidden by Nature; no artificial defences can entirely ward off the consequences. Polygamy is forbidden by *human* nature in the best sense of the term. Is there no other alternative? I think there is. It lies in *early marriage*. I would have every adult man and woman marry—if they desired it—irrespective of the present unwritten but powerful prohibition of Society; irrespective of the so-called imprudence of marrying while poor. The two people are alive and have to be fed as it is; it will cost no more to feed them married than to feed them single. But how about their offspring? it will be asked. And for answer, I say that at the worst, they are not obliged to have children if they do not wish. But if they do have children, I really think Nature may be trusted to find the means for their maintenance. The world is not nearly overpopulated as yet. There are oceans of room unoccupied, and square leagues on leagues of land untilled. When her resources of food fail, depend upon it, her activity in reproducing mouths to be fed will cease in proportion.

Whatever be the consequences of the early marriage which I commend, they cannot be physically so awful as those of Polyandry, nor morally so evil as those of Polygamy. The miserable victims of unruly passion would never *prefer* fornication to lawful wedlock if they could get it. Their excuse is that they are forced into sin by the cruel demands and prohibitions of society. Now, I declare that you will never get rid of fornication till you make it *needless*. Of course there are some for whom all forms of this indulgence have no attraction. For such we do not appeal. We only ask that those who desire to marry who must marry or sin, shall be allowed to marry irrespective of the contents of their purses, and that society shall account them honourable for so marrying rather than keep up the most degrading and poisonous vice that ever cursed mankind.

As to the treatment of seduction, I would go so far with "Clk." as to advocate the enactment of a law

binding a man to support the woman he had seduced as if she were his wife. But I would make a second seduction a case of bigamy, and put the man into prison. I suppose I must follow suit and, contrary to my taste and invariable practice, sign myself under an incognito. But you may freely tell the authorship of this letter to any one who wishes to know it. It strikes me I have said nothing that anyone could possibly be ashamed of.

CLERGYMAN AND PATERFAMILIAS.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE HISTORY OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE CHURCH AND PARISH OF ST. GEORGE-THE-MARTYR, HOLBORN." By J. Lewis Miller. London: Bowden, Hudson & Co, 23, Red Lion Street, London, W.C. 1881. Pp. 50.

This is a most interesting topographical sketch of what has been rightly styled a "model parish" in the heart of London, inhabited in Queen Anne's reign "by 173 persons who kept coaches," as well as by many eminent Lawyers, Physicians, Divines, and Writers of that and subsequent reigns. The Author gives curious and authentic extracts from the parish registers and account-books, respecting not only the formation of the Parish, its Church, and Burial Ground, but also the residences and lives of such men as Addison, Robert Nelson (the author of "The Fasts and Festivals of the Church of England"), and Lord Macaulay; Drs. Stukeley, Gibson, and Mead; Lords Hardwicke and Thurlow, and many others. In these days, when there is an expensive and, as we think, often an impolitic mania for building churches and creating small separate ecclesiastical districts, this little work will exemplify a natural, beneficial, and legitimate division of a parish, and should be studied by the administrators of the Ecclesiastical Commission, the Bishop of London's Fund, Church Building Societies, &c., who are instrumental in sub-dividing ecclesiastical districts. Such sub-division has, we believe, been carried out to an injurious extent in the East End, if not in the Central parts of London; *e.g.*, since the separation of this parish of St. George-the-Martyr, four other district parishes have been carved out of a moiety of St. Andrew, Holborn. The result is, either churches without congregations, and with badly-equipped, inefficient day and Sunday schools, or churches where services are conducted with an extravagantly florid, if not actually illegal, sensuous, and superstitious ritual, in order to attract an audience. For this, as well as other reasons, we heartily welcome this valuable contribution to the topographical and social history of Old London.

The Bishop of Durham has addressed a letter to the Archdeacon of Durham, in which he says:—"As the time is fast approaching when it will be necessary to arrange the confirmations for the coming year, I write to ask your co-operation in a change which I purpose making without any further delay. The endowment fund of the bishopric of Newcastle is now so far advanced that it would be faithless to doubt the speedy creation of the see. I therefore propose at once to re-arrange the scheme of confirmations, on the supposition that I shall henceforward be relieved from the care of Northumberland. The present is a specially opportune moment for inaugurating the change, inasmuch as, according to the present scheme, no confirmations are due this year in Northumberland, except at the great centres, Newcastle, Morpeth, Alnwick, and Berwick. If the Bishop of Newcastle should not be appointed in time to take the confirmations himself, I will see that they are provided for in some way or other. I will therefore ask you to take counsel with the Rural Deans in your archdeaconry, which (when the division takes place) will be co-extensive with the diocese of Durham."

On Wednesday week at a meeting of the Crewe District Church Association, the Rev. Charles Lane, vicar of Wheelock, proposed a resolution condemning the appointment by the Prime Minister of the Rev. Knox Little to a canonry at Worcester. It was carried unanimously, as also was another praying that Parliament would bring in a measure for the immediate deprivation of disobedient clergymen from their benefices instead of imprisoning them.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beckwith, Rev. James Sadler, curate of Benfieldside; vicar of Walker.
Cundy, Rev. Dr., rector of Miserden; rector of St. Paul's, Deptford.
Evans, Rev. J. M., vicar of Esholt-cum-Hawksworth, Leeds.
Gaisford, Rev. Stephen H., rector of Courthorpe, Wetherby.
Gill, Rev. Thomas Howard, rector of Whalley Range; rector of Trowbridge, Wilts.
Jeffery, Rev. J. W., curate of Scaland-in-Hawarden; vicar of Upperthong.
Mayne, Rev. J., vicar of St. Catharine, Gloucester; rural dean of Gloucester.
Owen, Rev. Frank, rector of St. Paul's, Deptford; rector of Miserden.
Pearson, Rev. Hugh, canon of Windsor and vicar of Sonning, Berks; deputy-clerk of the closet to her Majesty.
Ratcliffe, Rev. C. E. S., late curate of Digswell, Welwyn; English chaplain at Lyons.
Shore, Rev. Thomas Teignmouth, incumbent of Berkeley Chapel, Mayfair, honorary chaplain; chaplain in ordinary to the Queen.
Southwell, Rev. G. Bull, curate of Chetnole; inspector of Church Schools in the Third Division of the Rural Deanery of Shaftesbury.
Steele, Rev. W. Ferguson, curate of St. Simon's, Baptist Mills; vicar of St. Andrew's, Montpelier, Bristol.
Strand, Rev. Alexander, vicar of Holy Trinity, Hinckley.
Valpy, Rev. John C. W., rector of Burmarsh, near Folkestone; vicar of Alkham, near Dover.
Wardell, Rev. Henry J., curate of Ramsgate; vicar of Bekesbourne.
Willis, Rev. Robert George, rector of Goodmanham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Campbell, Rev. Arthur Bruce Knight, son of the Bishop of Bangor, at the Palace, Bangor, on the 26th ult., aged 30.
Heath, Rev. Lewis Wilson, M.A., vicar of St. John's, Newland, East Yorkshire. on the 19th ult., aged 70.
Meyricke, Rev. Robert, at Dinham Lodge, Ludlow, on the 14th ult., aged 80.
Meysey-Thompson, Rev. C. M., late rector of East Claydon, in America, on the 12th ult., aged 31.
Morshead, Rev. Henry John, for forty-eight years rector of Kelly, Devon, on the 25th ult., aged 74.
Upton, Rev. Robert, for fifty-two years priest of Moreton Say or Sea, Shropshire, at the Rectory, on the 19th ult., aged 81.
Whiting, Rev. Robert, thirty-three years rector of Ringsley-cum-Redisham, Parva, at Ringsfield Rectory, on the 23rd ult., aged 74.
Worsley, Rev. William, for nearly forty years rector of Bratoft, also perpetual curate of Irby, at Bratoft Rectory, Lincolnshire, on the 26th August, aged 81.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHURCH CONGRESS SERMON.

By the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. NICHOLAS'S, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, ON TUESDAY, OCT. 4TH, 1881.

"Unto me who am less than the least of all saints was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ: and to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God, Who created all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."—EPH. iii. 8—12. (R. V.)

THE last thoughts of a Christian man, drawn out of the depths of a wide and varied spiritual experience, are commonly the most precious; his last words the most memorable. And what are commonly called the "Epistles of the Imprisonment" contain the last thoughts and the last words of Paul. If we apply to spiritual phenomena the only reasonable canon of interpretation, we must suppose that his later horizon of vision was wider than his earlier, his convictions more settled, his sense of proportion quicker, his discrimination more penetrating, his faith more calm. "The thoughts of men are widened"—widened, at once, and deepened—"with the process of the suns." And Paul's thoughts seem to have been no exception to this moral law. No longer dazzled with "the brightness of that light" in which his Master first revealed Himself to his amazed soul—no longer helpless, though believing; no longer putting the question, as of a mind perplexed and overwhelmed, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"—his purged eye, purged, I take it, not by anything which he saw or heard when caught up into the third heaven, but by his actual experience of the methods of the Spirit of God upon the hearts of men, now seemed to see the height and depth and breadth and length of things—the limits of the possible and of the impossible—the "unveiled force" still in presence of veiled mysteries; the dispensation committed to the Church, and the place and functions of human instruments in it; the gifts and graces in their several scales, all measured by their profitableness to the use of edifying; the shadows and the substance; the transient and the immutable; the Christian temper and the law of duty; the place of each servant, according to his gifts, in the household of God; and the end and aim of all—that "the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, might make increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love." All these things he seems to see with intenser vividness and a clearer and fuller insight than he had ever seen them before. The foundation, of course, remains the same. How could that alter? But the stones which raise the building, storey upon storey, are laid with a more careful and (we may say) tenderer hand. The wisdom of the Master-builder—the ἀρχιτέκτων—is more apparent. "Each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord." The old warnings there; the old trenchant tones even; traces of the old severity. The dogs of the concision—the evil workers—the spoilers through philosophy and vain deceit—those who subjected themselves, or would subject others, to ordinances—those who taught things which had a "show of wisdom in will-worship and humility and severity to the body," while they were of no real "value against the indulgence of the flesh"—about these he does not hold his tongue—how could he without unfaithfulness?—but he tells his readers of them "even weeping," and the tones of bitter denunciation, which are to be traced in the Epistle to the Galatians, and even in the First to the Corinthians—of the efficacy of which he had doubts even when he used them—have almost entirely disappeared. Still, by manifestations of the truth, commending himself and his message to every man's conscience in the sight of God, he seems to feel the power of "the meekness and gentleness of Christ," even more fully than when he first used that sweet phrase to the Corinthians, in strange juxtaposition with his "readiness to avenge all disobedience," and the possibility that he might come unto them again, "not sparing," and "with a rod" in his hand.

It will be my object this morning to set before you some general considerations of a practical kind springing out of this last legacy to the Church of the great Apostle—of him, less than the least of all saints, to whom this grace was given to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. I will try to condense what I have to say into the smallest space. All inferences or references, applying to particular cases, I shall leave you to draw or make for yourselves. It is upon the larger outline and broader principles of things that I desire to fix your minds. I have only one critical remark to offer upon the text. I have adopted the now almost universally admitted reading *οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου* instead of the *κοινωνία* of the Textus Receptus, which Alford thinks has all the appearance of merely an explanatory gloss—the "dispensation" or "stewardship" of the mystery, instead of "the fellowship." The manuscript authority is far higher. The thought seems to me more Pauline. He regarded himself as "a steward of the mysteries of God;" and now that his time on earth, as he had been forewarned, was short, he naturally wished

to leave on record how, in his conception, at least, of things, this stewardship was to be discharged. It would savour of the audacity of the Schoolmen, intruding into things which I have not seen (I do not quote the words critically), and which assuredly have not been revealed, if I were to attempt to define with any precision how, through the Church, is made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God. But we are told by another Apostle that the ministries of the Church on earth are things which the angels desire to look into, stooping from their high estate to gaze, with what feelings we know not—mingled ones, methinks, they must be—upon the wondrous methods by which the wisdom of God endeavours to prevail upon and soften the hard and wilful hearts of the children of men; and that is pretty nearly all we know, or need to know. Whatever be the service that those angels are sent forth to do "for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation" (Heb. i. 14), its nature has been hidden from us—perchance, lest we should be tempted to "worship" them (Coloss. ii. 18), and the simplicity of our faith towards Christ should be perplexed rather than helped thereby. It is enough to know that amid the cloud of witnesses by whom we are surrounded, as we each run his race, there are the angels—we are "a spectacle to them;" and the whole Church, in all its alternations of success and failure, of defeat and conquest, is a "theatre" to them, upon which they look with fluctuating feelings of hope and fear, of joy and sorrow, of pity or shame. They are the essential features of this Church of the living God—the pillar and ground of the truth—the instrument, at once human and divine, through which the manifold wisdom of that God was to be made known and justified to the world—to which we believe that we, by every legitimate title of lineal descent, belong as truly as did those "saints in Ephesus," "faithful in Christ Jesus," in the Apostolic Age, that "Paul the Apostle of Christ by the will of God" dwells upon with such marked emphasis in this great Epistle. The notes that he indicates as the notes of the Church, are such as will last through all ages and amid all vicissitudes as long as there is revealed truth to be proclaimed, and a human but divinely endowed organisation needed to proclaim it. "It is good for us," while the arena is clouded with the dust of lesser controversies, "to be here;" to rise, if possible, into a purer, holier atmosphere, less disturbed by the vehemence of modern passions and prejudices; to realise, by no very violent effort of imagination, what this Church of Christ, builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit, was, in the design of her Divine Architect, intended to be; what, for a few brief years, she was; what it should be our effort to make her become again. Her days of greatest increase were days of peace, not days of strife; when the faith, once for all delivered to the saints, won its way, not because it had received the sanction of œcumenical councils, but by its own intrinsic power to persuade the souls of men; before articles got to be too curiously defined, or schools of religious thought formed themselves, and labelled each the other with human names—a golden age, indeed, of peace and charity and progress, which the perverseness and self-will of men, "seeking their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's," first disturbed, and then destroyed. How sweet and calm, amid the rage and tumult of the centuries, rises up before the contemplative mind, that vision, as the inspired historian has portrayed it, of the Churches of the first age—"Then had the Churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified: and walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied" (Acts ix. 31). Is it, like other golden ages, a thing past; perished, never to return? If it be, I fear the Church's power for conquest will have perished too. I signalise three of the Apostle's notes of the Church; three only, but they are the three chief, the three most truly fundamental. They are love; unity; the true function of the Christian ministry. To take these in order.

I. The apprehension of divine things in their simplicity, proportion, grandeur, is only possible to the soul that approaches contemplation of the great objective realities in the spirit of love. Faith energised by love—if I may adopt the rendering which has always commended itself most to my own mind—is the one availing thing. "For this cause," cries St. Paul, "I bow my knees unto the Father, from Whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; to the end that, being rooted and grounded in love, ye may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God" (Eph. iii. 14—19)—διὰ τῆς πίστεων : ἐν ἀγάπῃ: "through your faith;" but "in love." Faith, the hand which apprehends; but love which gives power and direction, and tenacity to the hand. Faith that grasps, but love that prevents that grasp from being relaxed; faith which believes, but love which knows in whom it has believed. Faith which prompts, but love which sustains. Love, implying everything that the name in its widest, noblest sense has ever been made to include. Love, exhibiting each of these several features which the same master hand has elsewhere sketched with such matchless power: love, that essence of the Christian temper, without which no separate soul can live; no aggregate of separate souls can ever

be more or better than a Church of Sardis or a Church of Laodicea. Can we discern this "note of the Church" vividly, distinctly, broadly among ourselves to-day? Shall we promote it by this Congress, which has drawn hither so many hundred Churchmen, representatives of almost every school of Christian thought? It is to be hoped that the outer world, when it reads and criticises our proceedings, will have no cause to reverse the verdict of an earlier age, and to say with a scorn, which they will be at no pains to conceal, "See these Christians, how they hate one another." At least we shall do well to be upon our guard; and tongues that need a bridle should put it on betimes. "Where jealousy and faction are," says another Apostle (I follow the revised translation), "there is confusion and every vile deed." "Love," says Augustine, "is the virtue of the City of God." (Enarr. in Psalm iv. 422 f.).

II. But I pass from the "note" of love to that of unity: from the soil in which faith grows to the fruit which it produces. "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord"—and I beg you to note the temper of the words that come from this call—"I, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called; with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, Who is over all, and through all and in all" (Eph. iv. 1—6). The noticeable thing here is the largeness, the simplicity—if I may add the word, the infiniteness—of the primitive creed. On no other than the broadest basis can you build up a Church which shall be truly Catholic—which shall embrace the world. The Church of Rome, by piling article upon article, each later invention making larger demands upon a reasonable faith, and at length, by her claim of absolute infallibility in matters of doctrine and morals for a man, repelling it utterly, has done her best to invalidate her proud pretensions to be the divinely appointed guide of Christendom into all truth. Not by instruments of this kind does the Spirit of Christ seem to have kept alive truth and faith in the world. Not by the peremptory decision of an œcumenical council—often the decision of a bare or narrow majority—and always the decision of men both separately and collectively fallible, does Paul trust that the faith of Christ will be maintained: but thus, "if in anything ye are otherwise minded"—εἴ τι ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε—"God will reveal even this unto you." (Phil. iii. 15.) "For my own particular," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in the preface to his great treatise on the "Liberty of Prophesying," "I cannot but expect that God, in His justice, should enlarge the bounds of the Turkish Empire, or some other way punish Christians, by reason of their pertinacious disputings about things unnecessary, undeterminable, and unprofitable. . . . How many volumes have been written about Angels, about Immaculate Conception, about Original Sin, when all that is solid reason or clear revelation in all these three articles may be reasonably enough comprised in forty lines! And in these trifles and impertinences men are curiously busy, while they neglect those glorious precepts of Christianity and holy life which are the glories of our religion, and would exalt us to a happy eternity. . . . . I am sure such things were never taught us by Christ and His Apostles; and if we were sure that ourselves spoke the truth, or that truth were able to justify herself, it were better if, to preserve a doctrine, we did not destroy a commandment, and out of zeal, pretending to Christian religion, lose the glories and rewards of ingenuity and Christian simplicity." (Vol. vii., pp. 432 and 424.) And in the face of the rapid and violent disintegration of Christian belief—with M. Rochefort in Paris parodying the Christian sacraments, and initiating little children by a form of his own into what he calls the gospel of free thought, and the International Federation of Free-thinkers holding its three days' conference in London, and delighting to trample on some of the most cherished hopes of man by announcing that the "Union Démocratique" of France is organising a great Free-thought demonstration on All Souls' Day—we cannot afford to bandy words upon disputable propositions—to divide ourselves into divers and almost hostile camps, each with its doctrine and interpretation—we dare not break up a great Church, with its mission as clearly stamped upon it as ever mission was stamped upon a Church planted even by Apostles' hands, into fragmentary and partisan organisations, powerless because disunited, incapable of discipline because following the voice of no one leader, recognising the sound of no one battle cry. If union ever was strength, it would be strength now; and union is only possible on the broad basis of an historical, not a theoretic, Christianity.

III. And what is the function of men—the part they have to play in this great conflict, terminable only with the Second Advent of Christ, between light and darkness, truth and falsehood, good and evil? What is the office of the Church, in the word's largest sense, as the divinely endowed, but yet human, institution, which it pleases God to use as His instrument in carrying out these far-reaching, eternal purposes? "The Prophetical office of the Church" was the title of one of the great theological treatises with which John Henry Newman enriched the literature of his country while he was yet the vicar of a parish in England, and before he became a Cardinal-Prince of Rome; and so Paul seems to regard the Church, as a whole, as a vast instrument for prophesying to men in the Name and for the Truth of God. "Unto each one of us

was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, 'When He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.' . . . And He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; . . . that, speaking the truth in love, we may grow up in all things into Him, which is the Head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."—(*Eph.* iv. 7, fol.) I am not careful to attempt an exact exegesis of this famous passage. Richard Hooker and others have done this, with more or less felicity. But it is evident that here is no thought of order, but of function. It is no question whether there are three or four ranks in the hierarchy of the Church, or even more. We need not even stay to discuss, with any pretence to accuracy, the possible discriminations in the writer's own mind of the fourfold elements into which the work of ministering is distributed, and to which the edifying of the body of Christ is due. With our imperfect sources of information we could not be sure of our conclusions, with whatever parade of learning they might be marshalled, even when we had arrived at them. The great proof, we know, of at least one Apostle was that, "through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God, from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum, he had fully preached the Gospel of Christ." To teach himself, and to charge others to teach; to give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching; to be able, by holding to the faithful Word according to the teaching, both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convict the gainsayers—this was Paul's highest conception of the office of a Christian Bishop. Even when the Kingdom of God was being set up in the world, they were the prophetical rather than the regal acts of its Divine Founder that struck men's minds, and drew the crowds after Him. "A great prophet," they said, "hath risen up amongst us; and God hath visited His people." And so it seems to me that now people are not seeking priests to absolve or to offer sacrifice for them, but prophets who can teach them and guide. Prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers—these are the needs of the Church to-day. Priests, possibly, for quiet, ordinary times; but prophets for crises. And if any one cannot see that the Church is passing through a crisis now—fiercer, sharper, more intense than any which has tried her for generations—he cannot read the most obvious signs of this time. And can we who claim, sometimes too exclusively, the prerogative of teaching, feel that we are teaching men that which it most concerns them to know? Are we helping them to be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine? Are we enabling them to be babes in malice, but in mind to be men? Have we ourselves that grasp of truth which comes of experimental conviction, and of nothing besides, and which alone can make men strong or free? To build up the body of Christ by the spirit of prophecy is no common gift and no ordinary responsibility. To be able rightly to divide the word of truth, is putting the highest faculty to the noblest use. What names stand out most conspicuous on the pages of the Church's story? The names of her great prophets and teachers—men like Athanasius, and Gregory of Nazianzum, and Chrysostom, and Augustine, and Bernard, and Savonarola, and Luther. These were they who stirred the hearts of their generation, and made religion, as a living force and not as a crystallised tradition, possible in the world.

We are looking full of hope to what our President may have to tell us of the prospects of the new see, which will owe so much to his self-sacrificing liberality, and to the fund for endowing which you are asked to contribute according to your ability to-day. I have been looking over the pages of our earliest ecclesiastical historian to gather up the story of how the Christian Church was first planted in Northumberland, in the days of good King Oswald, just twelve centuries ago. In the seventh century it had two famous Bishops—St. Aidan and St. Cuthbert, with an interval of fifty years between them—who took the title of their see not from Newcastle, but from Lindisfarne. This is the story of Aidan:—"It is related that when King Oswald asked for a prelate from the Scots to minister to himself and to his people the word of faith, there was first sent to him a man of an austere disposition, who, when after preaching for some time he made no progress, returned to his country and related in the assembly of the elders that he had not been able to effect anything in teaching the people to whom he had been sent, on account of their being intractable men, and of a harsh and barbarous disposition. Then they held a great debate in council as to what was to be done; and Aidan, who was present, said to the priest concerning whom the meeting was held, 'It seems to me, brother, that you have been too hard with your unlearned hearers, and have not afforded them, according to the Apostolic teaching, first the milk of easier doctrine, until, being nourished by degrees by the Word of God, they should be capable of receiving the more perfect, and of performing the sublimer precepts of God;' which being heard, the faces and eyes of all that sat there were turned towards him, and they earnestly discussed what he had said, and decreed that he himself was worthy

of the Episcopate, and ought to be sent to teach the unbelieving and unlearned, since, above all things, he was proved to be endued with the grace of discretion, which is the mother of virtues; and accordingly they ordained him, and sent him to preach. And he, in course of time, as he had before appeared to be adorned with the guidance of discretion, so afterwards exhibited the other virtues also."—(*Bede, E. H.*, iii., ch. 5, Gidby's Transl.) Does not this remind you of another Prophet, of Whom it is written, "He spake the word unto them as they were able to hear it."

And not less instructive is the story of Cuthbert:—"Not only (says Bede) did he afford to his own monastery both admonitions and examples of regular life, but he also took care to convert the common people who dwelt around far and wide from a life of foolish customs to the love of heavenly joys. Therefore, he frequently went forth from the monastery, sometimes on horseback, but oftener on foot, and going to the surrounding villages, taught the erring the way of truth. Furthermore, so great was Cuthbert's skill in speaking, so great his desire of enforcing what he took in hand, and such the light of his angelic countenance, that no one present presumed to conceal from him the secrets of his heart; all openly revealed by confession what they had done, because, forsooth, they thought that these same things could in no way escape his knowledge, and wiped out the sins they confessed by worthy fruits of penitence, as he enjoined. Moreover, he was wont mostly to traverse those places, and to preach in those little villages, which being situate afar off on steep and rugged mountains, others had a horror of visiting, and which repelled the access of teachers both by their poverty and rusticity. These, nevertheless, he willingly devoting himself to the pious labour, instructed with so great industry and skilful teaching, that often, when he had gone forth from the monastery, he did not return home sometimes for a whole month; but, tarrying among the mountaineers, he called the rustic people, both by the word of preaching and by the work of virtue, to heavenly things."—(*Ibid.*, iv., ch. 27.) And does not this remind us of more than one incident in the Apostolic story of Paul and Barnabas among the rude goatherds of Lycaonia winning them from their heathenism by the simple preaching of a living God, whose witness was in the rain and fruitful seasons; or again, at Ephesus, when through the preaching of Paul, "they that believed came and confessed and showed their deeds, and the Word of God grew mightily and prevailed." *Alia tempora, alii mores.* The fashions and the thoughts of the men of Northumberland are not the same to-day as they were 1,200 years ago. But the same qualities are required in a Bishop now that the historian signalises in Aidan:—"His zeal for peace and charity, for continence and humility; his mind the conqueror of anger and avarice, the contemner both of pride and vainglory; his diligence in both doing and teaching the divine commands; his practice of reading and watching; his authority becoming a priest in rebuking the proud and powerful; and likewise his tenderness in comforting the afflicted, in strengthening the weak, in relieving and defending the poor."—(*E. H.*, iii. ch. 17.) A noble portrait of a Bishop, simply and touchingly painted. It is by such teaching as this, illustrated by such a life as this, that even the hardest and rudest hearts can be won to the more excellent way. May he who will succeed to the Episcopate of Aidan and Cuthbert be as largely endowed with these graces as were they. They are the only weapons which the Church can wield with the assurance that they will prevail. They have been proved again and again, under every variety of circumstance. Whether for the Christian warfare of the seventh or of the nineteenth century, they are pieces of the "panoply of God." They are the forms in which the Spirit of Christ demonstrates His power. They put to flight the armies of the aliens. They confirm the hopeful, they revive the despondent. They strengthen believers; they take away all occasion from the adversary to speak reproachfully. We have no right to speak of the failure of the Gospel till these methods have been fairly and fully tried. The evil heart of unbelief is to be exorcised, not by magic after the fashion of the sons of Scæva at Ephesus, but by moral forces acting under their normal conditions, corroborated by the Spirit of God. If these fail, we may indeed despair of Christianity. But, O Spirit of Christ, Spirit of hope and confidence and joy in believing, lift up the hands that hang down, and strengthen the feeble knees! Inspire Thy Church with wisdom and with zeal, and send forth its soldiers conquering and to conquer in the strength of Christ's mighty Name!

THE SPIRIT AND THE LIFE.

By the Rev. T. G. BONNEY, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow and late Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached at Westminster Abbey on Sunday, Sept. 18th, 1881.

"It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."—St. John vi. 63.

THIS saying should count, to use a phrase becoming common, as epoch-making in the world's history. It enunciates a dominant principle, it strikes the key-note of Christian theology. As it has influenced mankind so has religion become a living power, as it has been forgotten so has the world been paralyzed by superstition. It was uttered at one of the great crises of our Saviour's mission life. By miraculously supplying the wants of a great multitude, He had brought to

a head the excitement developed by previous miracles in Galilee, where the people were by nature more impulsive, and Christ's apparent disregard of traditional observances and of the strict letter of the Mosaic law had probably given less scandal than in Judæa. An insurrectionary outbreak became imminent. The Saviour practically quelled it by the discourse recorded in the latter part of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Taking His recent miracle, and the sordid motives to which it had appealed as a starting-point, He explained to the astonished and perplexed people the true nature of His mission; He revealed to them, if they will understand, who and what He is. No mere man, more than and different from the great prophets or the great liberators commemorated in their national history: His deliverances were not to be those of Moses or of Judas Maccabeus, His kingdom not that of David or of Solomon.

For whatever purposes this revelation may have been designed, it was certainly successful in quelling the popular ardour. After this we do not hear of projects for placing Christ at the head of a rebellion. Indeed, it did more. The saying was too hard for others than the mere populace, and seems to have produced a wholesale defection among His more immediate followers. We cannot be surprised, for there are few sayings which, as history has shewn, have proved harder for His disciples in all the centuries since; few of which we may more truly say that it is one of the inconvenient declarations which the bulk of the Christian world has tacitly agreed to ignore.

I wish therefore this morning, so far as one can deal with a subject so wide in a brief space of time, to dwell a little on the meaning of these words and the thoughts which they more immediately suggest. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." We may place in close connection with them a phrase from St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians: God "hath made us able ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

In the previous discourse Christ had declared Himself to be the Bread of Life: had declared that to eat His flesh and drink His blood was necessary in order to obtain eternal life—for He was the Living Bread which had come down from heaven. In these words many have seen a special reference to the Eucharist. Into that controversy I do not purpose to enter further than to say that I do not think that they can in any way be limited to it, or to any sacramental ordinance, for they are vastly more comprehensive. I will add that in reference to it no warning is more needed than that which is conveyed in this discourse against literal interpretation of figurative expressions.

I pass on now to consider the terms which our Saviour applies to His words—that is to the teaching which He has been endeavouring to impart. They are spirit and they are life. Of course the general meaning of the precept is "Do not restrict yourself to the hard literal meaning of each word and phrase. I am telling you of things transcending the relations of this world, and therefore can only use its words as analogies and metaphors. My task is to lay down principles of action rather than hard and fast rules of conduct; My kingdom is one in no relation to the territories and races of this world, to its changeful web of birth and death, but to the unseen, the unconditioned and the eternal.

The terms which the Saviour applies to His words "spirit" and "life," are very frequently in our mouths, but they are nevertheless terms which we should find it very hard to define. Take first the term Spirit. There are few more common in religious discourse and theological dispute, and yet few to which a definite meaning is more rarely attached. In the Greek language there is one word which, according to the context, is differently translated in our version. It occurs for example in the well-known passage, "The wind bloweth where it listeth"; it is used in the Pauline writings to express that highest part of man's tripartite nature—body, soul, and spirit—which differences him from the rest of the animal kingdom, that divine gift whereby he becomes, if I understand the Apostle's words aright, an heir of immortality. It is applied also to that person of the Trinity whom we designate the Holy Ghost. Thus the human breath, the light breeze, the gentle movement of an apparently immaterial substance, the non-material part of man, the unconditioned something which energizes all nature is expressed by this one word πνεῦμα, which we commonly render spirit. I admit that except by negatives we cannot properly define it. That is the case with many things which lie outside the sphere of this world's experiences—even of some, life for instance, within it—but this does not prevent us from attaching a fairly definite idea to its meaning. When these words were spoken by the Saviour, there was nothing known which would convey the idea of something at once most immaterial and energizing better than the gentle movement of the invisible air. Other analogies, a little more perfect might perhaps be suggested as results of increased scientific knowledge, but the purpose of the old one is still clear. Again, as regards the word Life. We can hardly define its meaning. It expresses a great mystery, to the comprehension of which science has helped us but little. Though so far as we know inseparable from the material, though possibly a condition of the material, it is not itself material. It is incapable so far as we know of spontaneous generation. Life must come from life. It is the thing most divine in our daily experience, the antagonist to immobility and decay, the very essen-

tial of progress and growth. By these two terms then, expressing entities mysterious yet familiar, the antitheses of all that is rigid, immoveable, decadent, and corruptible, our Saviour characterises His words; words which were to be for all time a source of spirit, and a well-spring of life. Once more, let us seek in an analogy a fuller illustration of the wondrous significance of these few words. Cast back your glance through the long vista of ages upon the past history of this earth. Watch in your mental vision—we will take the boldest hypothesis of science—that vast cloud of whirling vapours slowly shrinking down into an incandescent mass, from which the various orbs of our solar system are, one by one, flung off like monstrous molten drops. One among these is our earth. Watch its surface darkening and hardening as it cools, till atmospheric vapours float around and seas can gather in its depressions. Observe, as myriads of unrecorded years pass by, the changes wrought by agencies from within and from without; the slow sculpturing of each contour till we see the globe as now with every variety of swelling hill and serrate mountain range, of winding valley and spreading plain. What has done all this? we ask. The forces of Nature, men reply. But what are they: why have they this power? What is the "It," the one thing in many modes, which manifests itself in the gravitation of the earth, the building of the crystal, the ceaseless undulations of light and heat, the marvels of electricity and the like? We call this Force, but the name really makes us none the wiser.

Look back also on the countless forms of living creatures that have peopled this earth. Watch them—again to take the bolder hypothesis—slowly modifying themselves to suit the changing circumstances of the globe till by gradual evolution in the long succession of ages they arrive at the types with which we are now familiar. Why is all this? What is this vital force which when affected by physical forces has brought about results so marvellous. You may devise as many terms—lengthy and learned as you please—but you will know just as much and just as little as if you said that all this vast history of many pages and many volumes was a record of the operation of Spirit and Life.

Like then to these in the world of science so were Christ's words to be in that world which we call for want of a better term spiritual. His words were to be the seeds, His life was to be the origin of a new life. Given free play, they would have regenerated this world by making its kingdoms in the fullest sense the kingdoms of God; as it is, they have shared the lot of all that has come upon our earth, and have struggled for existence with many competitors.

Thus the history of Christianity—and more or less of every religious system—has been that of a conflict between the flesh and the letter on the one hand, and the spirit and the life on the other. Of these the flesh may be taken as representing the attempt to materialize the living words, the letter the attempt to petrify them by the rigidity of a theologic formula. The two tendencies may exist together, or they may be in opposition, now one now the other predominating, but they are the inevitable foes of all that is truly spiritual. Perhaps they are never so dangerous as when conceptions which are really of the flesh are mistaken for the inner spiritualism of religion, and a ready acquiescence in the unauthorized fancies of men not always even learned or well meaning is considered to be a proof of faith. If we look back upon the history of the Christian Church we see in it a record of this unending struggle—the Judaism of one party in the Early Church—the hankering after the Mosaic distinctions of clean and unclean, of rites and ordinances—was the first indication of the materialistic tendency. Then with changed face it appeared as an excessive trust in and an overvaluing of institutions distinctively Christian: in exaggerating the operation of the various means of grace, of prayer, of baptism, of the eucharist, of ordination, and the like, nntil they were unconsciously placed on the level of magical incantations. From this, by natural transition, it passed to the varied forms of superstition which still survive among some Christian bodies, such as a belief in the efficacy of relics, holy places, particular forms of prayer, and special ceremonials, together with various other carnal ordinances and material conceptions of spiritual facts too numerous to mention. In the same way, if we watch the tendency to a blind following of the letter, we see it gradually developing into that fondness for minute theological distinctions which is so conspicuous in the fourth and next succeeding centuries, when so-called orthodoxy veiled a multitude of sins, when rival disputants thundered alternate anathemas, when charity and every Christ-like grace were forgotten, as even bishops yelled and fought in the most solemn gatherings in the council-chambers of the Church. The history of dogma, properly so called, is to a great extent the history of the triumph of the flesh and of the letter over the spirit and the life.

But, did I intend to point the moral through byegone controversies only, I should not have brought the subject before you. The danger is no less rife in our own days. Never in recent history have these warning words of the Saviour been more needed than in the epoch in which we are now living. Men commonly talk of unbelief and want of faith as its crying evils, its imminent danger. I should say that superstition and dogmatism were greater far because they are the more subtle, and because they rank themselves as defenders of the truth. I grant that a sceptical spirit in matters other than scientific prevails widely. I grant that unbelief has not been for perhaps a century past so widely prevalent, or at any rate so outspoken,

as it is now; but I would ask, Are not the remedies which many would have us adopt even more dangerous than the disease? To speak only of our own branch of the Church, men of middle life are sometimes perplexed to know whether the Church in which we minister is the one in which we were brought up. We find that there is virtue in a garment and efficacy in a ceremony; we find that materialized conceptions of flesh and blood, notwithstanding this chapter of St. John's Gospel, are not out of place in what we had deemed the most spiritual ordinance of our Church; we find a gradually increasing host of ceremonies and practices which, if insignificant are puerile, and if significant are, so far as I can understand, irreconcilable with this fundamental declaration of the Founder of our Church. Side by side with this there is manifested a desperate tenacity in clinging even to phrases, which are really but expressions of obsolete opinion, minimized in meaning even by their warmest defenders, as well as a desire for more precise definitions, for fresh declarations of what is called the faith; in short, for new dogma as opposed to old doctrine.

But it will be said, Remove reverence, remove dogma, and what do you leave behind? I reply, first, that superstition, which I would remove, is not identical with reverence; neither is dogma, which I would minimize, with doctrine. Superstition ends by forgetting the thing signified in the symbol: reverence passes away from the symbol to the thing signified. Dogma, or that which is declared concerning spiritual relations on human authority, is associated with this inevitable evil—that as spirit and life, in the fullest and highest sense, with all their relations, transcend our faculties, our words are symbols for entities imperfectly known and in some respects unknowable; our analogies, derived from the finite relations of finite beings, have an inherent and incurable defect. Thus each dogma gives a permanency to an expression of imperfect knowledge, and in its very nature says to the enquiring spirit, to the developing life, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no further." For we must remember—what is often forgotten—that the history of Christ and His immediate followers comprehends all doctrine which is essential to the salvation of man. He spake with authority, and so in a certain sense imparted dogma; but then He spake as never man spake, and this makes all the difference. His doctrine is the Word of God; dogma the word of man, presumably but not necessarily founded on the Word of God. What Christ said, what Christ did, is what is of the first concern to our spiritual life, and this is a question of human evidence rather than of human authority, not of dogma but of history. This may be enough to shew that these words of our Master have a very close personal interest for each one of us. As that first band of disciples had to choose, so has each one of us to decide whether we are content to follow Christ whither He leads into the domain of spirit and life, or remain clinging to dead ordinances. Doubtless the law of Moses involves less responsibility than the law of Christ—to live according to rules is easier than to live according to principles. Most people in their hearts incline to the former, and prefer, if it be skilfully disguised, tutelage to freedom. But, both as individuals and nations, we have to select not what is most pleasant but what is best for us. Winsome as is the docility and grace of childhood, we cannot be, we cannot retain others, children always. We may for a time oppose the law of growth and check development, but nature will have its revenges. Better, then, to accept the inevitable. It may cost us something to part with artificial helps; it may make sometimes the battle against sin in our own hearts and in the world around the harder; we may fight for a time at a temporary disadvantage; but we have our Master's promise that even in the hour of our seeming defeat He will aid and protect. Though as regards ourselves the way may often be hard, the mental conflicts severe, the path of life a perplexity, yet from time to time there will be glimpses of the serene immensity of heaven through the mists of earth; and as the evening-tide draws on these very clouds will gleam with unwonted glories when our eyes are enabled to gaze less dazzledly upon the softened splendour of the sun which is setting upon our little day of earthly life.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1881.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE NEWCASTLE CHURCH CONGRESS.

TREADING in the footsteps of my predecessors, I will commence by discharging a formal duty which devolves on me as President of this Congress—formal only as recurrent from year to year, but not formal as deficient either in sincerity or in warmth. I therefore bid you a hearty welcome to this ancient town and county of Newcastle, well-known as the largest and busiest centre of commercial and industrial activity in this busy North, but destined before long (as we hope) to assume a greater prominence in the eyes of Churchmen, as the centre of a new diocese. At such a moment the session of the Congress at Newcastle is especially well-timed. The reception

of a large representative assembly of the Church will fitly close the history of the ancient diocese of Durham. The old see will be fortified by its presence for the severance; the new see will be ushered in amidst the happiest auguries. Why need I say more? For Newcastle itself the prompt and generous action of the Mayor, Sheriff, and Corporation speaks with a directness and an eloquence, of which any words of mine would only blunt the edge. It remains for me to supplement their action by expressing to you the welcome of the clergy and laity—of the Churchmen—of the diocese at large.

Christian brothers and fellow-Churchmen, I am reminded that this year the institution, over whose meeting it is my privilege to preside, attains its majority. This is the twenty-first anniversary of the Church Congress. It is, therefore, with singular pleasure that I welcome among those who are present on this platform and those who have promised to take part in the subsequent proceedings not a few names, both lay and clerical, which occupy a prominent place in the report of the first Church Congress held twenty years ago. It must be a sincere gratification to them to see the weakly infant, which they nursed through its childish ailments with so much care, grown up into the sturdy manhood of to-day. I myself remember well the modest gathering in the hall of King's College, Cambridge, at which I was present as a humble listener. Certainly, I should have treated it as the wildest romance—a very dream of dreams—if any one had then prophesied either that two decades later the modest assemblage of that day would have grown into these vast dimensions, or that I myself, by virtue of my office, should be called to preside over its meeting in this great centre of commercial activity. The Congress was fitly cradled in its infancy beneath the academic shades of Cambridge and Oxford. It no less fitly celebrates its robust maturity in a busy port town of the rough and hardy North. It is instructive to turn over the pages of the report of the first Church Congress—a slender book or rather booklet, a strange contrast to the bulky volumes which record the proceedings of its later years. Shall I be pardoned if, to celebrate the majority of the Congress, I broach the vintage which was laid down at its birth? The report is eminently suggestive, as read by the light of twenty years' experience. It enshrines side by side controversies dead and living. It embodies hopes and fears alike unfulfilled—fears that are fears no more, and hopes that remain hopes still. As an example of the former, there is the question of church rates—the burning question of the day. Not even a spark of this fire, which threatened to become a mighty conflagration, lives in the smouldering ashes now. It is a dead controversy—dead and buried past recal. The gloomy forebodings, which attended its funeral have not been fulfilled. Church rates have long ceased to exist. Yet the fabrics of our churches were never so numerous, so sound, and so well cared for as now. As an instance of the latter, take the increase of the Episcopate. Here is a question of living and lively interest—never more lively than at the present moment, nowhere more lively than in this huge overgrown northern diocese. I turn to the report of the discussion on this subject, and I find a reader of one of the papers—now a Bshop of one of the already subdivided dioceses—expressing himself thus:—"There are two or three dioceses whose peculiar condition seems to call for immediate subdivision, and which may be fairly dealt with at once. Clearly Exeter is the first, perhaps Durham may come next." In the discussion which followed, a speaker endorsed this opinion:—"There could be no doubt," he said, "that the claims of Cornwall and of Durham for a greater amount of Episcopal supervision were very strong." Twenty years have elapsed since then. Infants in long clothes have grown up to manhood and womanhood. The population of the diocese of Durham, even then excessive, has increased more than 50 per cent. in this period. Exeter did come first, though not immediately. Cornwall received its first Bishop four or five years ago, with what happy results I need not say. But Durham did not follow next. St. Albans and Liverpool have interposed, while Durham still waits expectant. "Usquequo, Domine?" Lord, how long?

This year, in which the Church Congress celebrates its majority, is full of significance for those who have eyes to see and ears to hear. Look at the synchronisms which it offers. They will supply food for much serious reflection—suggestions and warnings which will remind Churchmen of the great responsibilities and (if she is true to herself) the great destinies of their Church, and thus brace them for the struggles of the coming years. Speaking in this place, I cannot forget that only a few months ago was celebrated in this town the centenary of the birth of a native engineman, to whom, more than to any one person, is due the great social and material revolution of our age. It may seem strange to give this prominence to the name of George Stephenson in a Church Congress. Yet a moment's reflection shows that the Church is expected at every turn to reckon with the results of his work, and nowhere more than in this immediate neighbourhood. In a thousand ways the spread of railways has altered the conditions of life, accelerating travel, quickening commercial and industrial energy, promoting the rapid interchange of ideas, and intensifying human existence in a thousand ways. With the vast and varied results of this new and potent force, suddenly introduced into the world, the Church of Christ is required to cope. Look at its effects on our parochial system, which, not without reason, we value so highly. This great centripetal and centrifugal

force, first aggregating great masses about the popular centres, then again repelling them outward, this mighty tyrant which uproots, and transfers, and plants down whole populations with a rigour and peremptoriness which a Babylonian or Persian king of old might well have envied—here is an antagonist which it requires all the strength and all the nerve which the Church can command to subdue and to reduce to order. The diocese of Durham gave the railway and the locomotive to England and to the world. Will you not in return advise us in this Congress how we may best meet the demands thus created? I say us, for nowhere has the strain upon the resources of the Church—spiritual and material—been greater than here.

But this is not the only synchronism which the year suggests. Only a few weeks ago, in the metropolis of this northern province, in which it had its birth, the British Association for the Advancement of Science celebrated its jubilee. The president availed himself of the occasion to sum up the achievements of the half-century past—untrodden fields opened out, fresh sciences created, a whole world of fact and theory discovered, of which men had hardly a suspicion at the beginning of this period. In this commemoration we are reminded of the revolution in the intellectual world which has taken place in our own time, as in the other our attention was directed to the revolution in the social and industrial world. Here again we are confronted with a giant force, of which the Church of Christ must give an account. If we are wise we shall endeavour to understand and to absorb these truths. They are our proper heritage as Christians, for they are manifestations of the Eternal Word, Who is also the Head of the Church. They will add breadth and strength and depth to our theology. Before all things we shall learn by the lessons of the past to keep ourselves free from any distrust or dismay. Astronomy once menaced, or was thought to menace, Christianity. Long before we were born the menace had passed away. We found astronomy the sworn ally of religion. The heresy of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries had become the orthodoxy of the nineteenth. When some years ago an eminent man of science, himself a firm believer, wrote a work throwing doubt on the plurality of worlds, it was received with a storm of adverse criticism, chiefly from Christian teachers, because he ventured to question a theory which three centuries earlier it would have been a shocking heresy to maintain. Geology next entered the lists. We are old enough, many of us, to remember the anxiety and distrust with which its startling announcements were received. This scare, like the other, has passed away. Our theological conceptions have been corrected and enlarged by its teaching, but the work of the Church of Christ goes on as before. We admire the providential design which through myriads of years prepared the earth by successive gradations of animal and vegetable life for its ultimate destination as the abode of man. Nowhere else do we find more vivid and striking illustrations of the increasing purpose which runs through the ages. Geology, like astronomy, is fast becoming our faithful ally. And now, in turn, biology concentrates the same interests, and excites the same distrusts. Will not history repeat itself? If the time should come when evolution is translated from the region of suggestive theory to the region of acknowledged fact, what then? Will it not carry still further the idea of providential design and order? Will it not reinforce with new and splendid illustrations the magnificent lesson of modern science—complexity of results traced back to simplicity of principles variety of phenomena issuing from unity of order—the gathering up, as it were, of the threads which connect the universe, in the right hand of the One Eternal Word?

Thus we are reminded by these two celebrations of the twin giants, the creation of our age, with which the Church of Christ has to reckon—foes only, if they are treated as such, but capable of being won as trusty allies by appreciation, by sympathy, by conciliation and respect. Shall I be forgiven if I trespass still further on your time and ask your attention to a third synchronism, not less suggestive than the former, though in a different way?

As we meet for our discussions to-day the echoes are still lingering in our ears of a great œcumenical conference—the first, I believe, of its kind—representing a body, or rather an aggregate of bodies, of Christians, whose influence pierces various strata of society and ranges over two great continents—a spiritual power which all, even the most intolerant, must view with admiration and respect, with whatever regrets these feelings may be mingled. When we remember that the rise of Methodism dates only a century and a half ago, and when we reflect that it was the offspring of our own Church and nation, we have food enough for many anxious questionings. What regrets for the past, and what warnings for the future, does it not suggest to us? What lessons of organization, of sympathy, of adaptation does it not read to us? Why should not this great spiritual mechanism have been retained within the Church to which it owed its being? Why, when it started with being a society, should it have ended in becoming a Church? Could not the same results have been purchased at a less heavy sacrifice than the loss of unity?

Almost all our religious difficulties may be traced to an inability to appreciate the true proportion of things. It will be useful, therefore, to contemplate these synchronisms, because they raise the really great issues with which the Church of England has to deal. Side by side with these,

our internal disputes and dissensions must seem infinitely paltry and trifling. Who can contemplate without awe the vast masses of our unevangelised, uncivilised fellow-countrymen, which the conditions of modern life have herded together, only to remove them farther and farther from the control of the Gospel? Who can reflect without pain on the alienation of so many educated and half-educated men, and the wavering allegiance of so many more, though all the while deep hidden—

> In many a brave, though bleeding, heart
> There lurks a yearning for the Healer's face—
> A yearning to be free from hint and guess,
> To take the blessings Christ is fain to give?

Who can witness without deep searchings of heart the growth of so many communities of zealous Christians around us, striving to do the work which ought to be done by ourselves? And we meanwhile are disputing among ourselves—about what? But, if the time of our meeting is exceptional, the place is not less so. In no other English diocese is the work of the Church beset with greater difficulties. A glance at the map will reveal this. No other diocese can boast four considerable tidal rivers, with their accompaniments of shipbuilding, commerce, manufacture, fisheries, and the like—to say nothing of a coast-line stretching out for a hundred miles. No other diocese contains so large an underground population as is found in Durham and the Tyneside. No other diocese, or hardly any other, can show such extensive parishes, with scattered rural populations (a farm here and a cottage there), as exist in considerable parts of Northumberland, where (notwithstanding recent divisions and sub-divisions) you will still come across parishes from fifteen to twenty miles long. Moreover, the diocese presents another difficulty peculiar to it. Having a long stretch of boundary on the Scottish border, it receives a large overflow from Presbyterianism. The Presbyterian Church or Churches are especially strong in Northumberland, though this strength naturally diminishes as we recede from the frontier. I am thankful to say that, as a rule, there is no hostility to the Church of England in these bodies; we live together on very friendly terms, as I trust we always shall live. But the fact remains that the Church of England, as a spiritual organization, is weakened by this want of unity. I might enlarge still further on the peculiar difficulties of this diocese, but I desist. Enough has been said to show that the sturdy majority of the Congress is fitly celebrated in a place where it is surrounded with the hardest problems which can tax the energy and the resources of our Church.

My predecessors in the presidential chair have not unfrequently spent time in apologies for Church Congresses. It is unnecessary for me to follow their example. Their popularity is their justification. We cannot, indeed, in these remote northern regions,

> Extra anni solisque vias,

as our friends of the sunnier south seem to regard them—we cannot hope to rival the numbers assembled at the more accessible "holiday" centres like Brighton or Croydon. But making due allowance for these and other incidental causes of fluctuation, we may safely say that the popularity of these Congresses has been steadily increasing. The main objection urged against them amounts to a complaint that they do not do what they never were intended to do, and what from their very nature they cannot do—that they carry no practical measures, but end in talk. I do not believe that they end in talk. I am confident that they stimulate both individual and collective action. I feel sure that they are largely instrumental in forming opinion. These seem to me to be not unimportant results. But in deference to the criticisms—I must say, the very reasonable criticisms—which have been offered, I cast about in my mind whether it was possible to guide them to any direct practical action, and I confess that I have not seen my way. So long as the Church Congress is composed of fortuitous atoms, varying from year to year, so long as the members are self-appointed—the only condition being the profession of Church membership and the payment of a trifling sum—I do not see that this is attainable; nor, even if attainable, is it a thing to be desired. We must take care not the create unawares a monster whose movements we cannot predict or control. Moreover, such a momentous change could not be the act of a single president or committee. It must come from a body which could claim in some sense to speak for the Church at large. Under these circumstances we could do nothing better than strive to improve the existing machinery. We have accordingly extended the sphere of the working men's meetings—an element of growing importance in these Congresses. We have added a working women's meeting, believing that in a society in which is "neither male nor female" we are bound to provide for the wants of the wives and sisters, not less than of the husbands and brothers. Lastly, we have paid great attention to the programme. We have withheld nothing; we have dissembled nothing. We have avoided no question because it is burning; we know that where there is no fire there can be no warmth and no heat. We did not underrate the tension of feeling in the Church at the present moment; but we determined to give to all parties alike fair and equal opportunities of expressing their opinions on the questions at issue. We had a confidence (it is for you to show that it was not misplaced)—we had a confidence that a frank and generous policy would meet with a frank and generous response; that the readers and speakers would state their views calmly and clearly, without asperity, without exaggeration, without personalities, avoiding everything which would cause unnecessary irritation; that the hearers would listen with patience and

forbearance, remembering that no confession of impotence is so damaging as the refusal to hear an adversary's argument; and that both alike would bear in mind the golden rule of the Apostle which directs that the ultimate appeal of the conscience shall be to the peace of Christ, as the supreme umpire and referee, ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. This is not the theatre at Ephesus, and ours is not the worship of the great goddess Diana. As the subjects of the Prince of Peace, we shall seek peace, we shall ensue peace. Only so can we dare to pray that the deliberations of this Congress may be guided by the Holy Spirit to the glory of God and the welfare of the Church of Christ. I, therefore, in accordance with established usage, invite all present, with one heart and one voice, to say with me the Apostles' Creed, as the symbol of unity and the pledge of peace.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I earnestly hope that before you close this most profitable discussion you will philanthropically devote a Leader to detailing the terrible consequences which follow from syphilis. The system of silence has indeed been carried on too long, and it has proved itself *barren*. I have reason to believe that many a young man would be saved from this leprosy if his father were able to bring himself to act up to the promptings of common sense by casting aside his prudery and warning his son in plain language. Will parents never awake to their responsibilities? Will they go on sending their innocent boys and girls to large boarding-schools without even giving a hint of the dangers certainly there? Our philanthropists would not find their shillings returning to them void if they invested them in printing, for gratuitous circulation, leaflets describing the results of syphilis and masturbation. Allow me also to commend you for your fearlessness and impartiality in opening your columns to such advanced thinkers as "Clk." and "Charles Voysey." As the latter finely says in his recent sermon, "Science and Religion":—"The influence of the discovery of Truth, whatever it be, cannot but be good; it seems nothing short of treason to doubt or deny it." Allow me, too, to commend "An Irishwoman" for her grand and faithful protest, and especially Miss Bewicke for having risked her fair name, for in Ireland it is not yet "proper, still less fashionable, for ladies to discuss this subject."

AN IRISH CURATE.

SIR,—I think your correspondent who advocates *early marriage* as a remedy against sin is quite right, and hope he and others will succeed in weakening the "unwritten and powerful prohibition of Society" to which he alludes; but I do not think he is equally right when he says that married people "are not obliged to have children if they do not wish." How can they, without sin, avoid having children? They can only do so by adopting such a course as that against which God expressed his heavy displeasure (Gen. xxxviii. 9, 10), or a custom I believe pursued in France on the part of the woman, and which seems no less unnatural and displeasing to God. All such unnatural means for avoiding the procreation of children appear to me of the nature of "uncleanness" which is constantly condemned in Scripture; moreover, to partake of a gratification and avoid the responsibility and care of children which such gratification was intended by God to be followed by, appears like defeating His purposes and wishes. As your correspondent truly observes, "The world is not overpopulated yet." I would therefore join in encouraging early marriage, and say "Be fruitful, multiply, replenish the earth" and spread abroad.

ANOTHER CLERGYMAN AND PATERFAMILIAS.

CHURCH BUILDING.

SIR,—Mr. Thring says, in correction of some statements of mine, that Art is a language. Granted. But, like all other language, it may be used to express either truth or falsehood. And, when applied to religion, it is, from the limitation of its own nature, but too apt to express the latter. For Art, being itself material, and entirely confined to material things, can only express the truths of matter—for example, of earth or sea or sky; of cloud or sunshine; of light or shade; of herbage or foliage; of animal form or motion; of thought and feeling as depicted in the human face; and other such like things. It may even idealise material things, designing a form of ideal physical beauty, as in a Venus; or even a face of ideal moral beauty, as in One, Whom, in this connection, I would prefer not to name. But when it attempts to step beyond the limits of matter and sense, and to portray a spiritual being or idea, it only materialises and carnalises it, so that the result is not truth but falsehood. When applied to religion, Art is very often the handmaid of idolatry. Nothing owes so much to Art as that worship of the Host in the Roman Church, which our sacerdotalists are so eager to revive among ourselves; nor can anything be imagined more splendid and impressive, when architecture, music, and scenic art have done their utmost to adorn it. But if we coldly strip the decorations away, we find the nucleus of the ceremony to be a Fetish, or thing-god, of the same low type that is derided by Isaiah (xliv. 16, 17), and still worshipped in Dahomey. The effect of Art, in that case, has been to excuse to refined as well as to uncultivated minds the degradation of the high spiritual idea of absorbing and assimilating, through Faith, the moral and spiritual nature of the Man of men, into the gross carnal one of swallowing, with the bodily organs, a material substance, supposed, through sacerdotal incantations, to have acquired the property of containing and conveying Deity. In this case Art teaches and symbolises, let us say fiction, to avoid using the harsh word, falsehood.

W. E. RAWSTORNE.

The Church of England Pulpit.

PESSIMISM—ATHEISM.

By the Ven. ARCHDEACON REICHEL, D.D., Rector of Trim and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin.

Sermon Preached at a Harvest Thanksgiving on Wednesday, Sept. 21st, 1881.

"And yet He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness."—Acts xiv. 17. (R.V.)

WE are met together, my brethren, this morning, to express our thankfulness to God for the blessing of an excellent harvest. And the day on which we are thus met, seems to introduce a further, a more spiritual, element of thankfulness into our service. It is the day dedicated by our Church to the special remembrance of St. Matthew the Apostle, who left a very gainful profession for the purpose of devoting himself to the following of our blessed Lord, and becoming a witness to His deeds, a hearer of His words: and who afterwards left an undying remembrance of himself in the Gospel which the most ancient tradition of the Church unanimously ascribes to him. By this, the most important in some respects, of all the Gospels, the Apostle and Evangelist St. Matthew has indeed earned a title to the everlasting gratitude of Christendom. The doubts that have been cast on the authorship of this document in recent times by the wantonness of subjective criticism are rapidly giving way before the more enlightened and less prejudiced learning of the newest investigators. And the Gospel of St. Matthew is being gradually recognised as the contemporaneous production of an actual follower and companion of our Lord.

Our Church has held a wise mean in respect of commemorating departed excellence. She admits into her calendar no personage whose existence and character are not avouched by Holy Scripture: and amongst all those heroes of faith, she yet further limits her commemorations to the Apostles and Evangelists. Thus she at once acknowledges the principle that our religion is not merely emotional, but historic; and confines her historic view to those concerning whom there cannot be a shade of doubt. Many of the saints received into the calendar of the Romish Church were persons of very doubtful lives: of some it is doubtful whether they ever lived at all. Our Saints' Days all relate to persons who deserve remembrance and veneration, as being the immediate attendants of Christ, or those who have handed down the record of His works and teaching for our endless comfort.

I need hardly pause to remark to a congregation like this, that in commemorating these true benefactors of our race, our Church does not in the least exalt them to any improper position. She never addresses prayers to them: she never directs her children to draw near to God through their supposed intercession. She simply draws attention by the days appointed in their name, to the fact of their having lived for Christ and died for Christ, and as in the case of St. Matthew, to the further fact that he and some others have written brief testimonies of their beloved Master's actions; books, which, brief as they are, and unpretending, are yet beyond all price: and even by unbelievers—at least by all unbelievers who have the slightest taste or learning—are acknowledged as masterpieces of their kind, unique in literature, and which the most cultivated races of mankind will never willingly let die.

I turn from this part of my double subject to that which the thanksgiving service we have just taken part in more particularly enforces on us—I mean, the duty of being thankful to Almighty God for the preservation of the race of men upon this globe by the giving to them the fruits of the earth, after their kind, in due season. There are some philosophical schemes, broached especially by German thinkers, and adopted by persons amongst ourselves with an eagerness, partly due to mistaken respect for anything produced by that supposed profoundly thinking race, partly to be ascribed to a very general despondency, a heart-sinking, characteristic of the times—there are, I say, some philosophical schemes which consider this world as a huge mistake, the result of the fortuitous combination of its primal atoms. It would have been better for us, at least, if man had never come into existence. He suffers much more than other animals do: his sufferings at the moment are not only far greater in consequence of his more exquisite nervous organisation, but they are further enhanced by his having the unhappy gift of anticipation, if not of actual foresight: by means of which he expects suffering to come, and suffers it before it comes. And while lower animals are perfectly contented with their lot, so far as we can see, men never are; they are always reaching forth to something not yet attained, perhaps unattainable; and all this eager pursuit of what is not yet in possession is invariably disappointed at the last by death: which carries us off, before the eye is sated with seeing and the ear with hearing and the mind with knowing and the body with enjoying. We are a mistaken breed, it seems; anomalous of a most peculiar type, inasmuch as our very perfections relatively to other

animals are precisely those parts or qualities in us in which we fall short of the satisfaction which other animals invariably attain to. This strange, uncomfortable system, which is denominated pessimism, or the doctrine that all is not for the best but for the worst, is, however, only the natural, or rather, the inevitable outcome of the fashionable unbelief of these times. If human beings are only animals—in other words, if they only live whilst they live visibly on earth—I do not see how it is possible to avoid the conclusion that they are indeed far the least really happy, far the most miserable of all sentient creatures. For the pleasures they have are very much in common with those enjoyed by animals; but the pains they endure infinitely transcend those endured by animals. And these pains are all brought to a climax by the terrible thought that whilst life, in its fulness, is the great object craved really by all, life will soon end, end totally and for ever, in the case of each; that there is no hereafter to satisfy the aspirations of the here. And there is a yet further element of misery in the disappointment of the natural desire of each that what is right should triumph over what is wrong. That this is a quite natural desire, I think I may take for granted without laboriously proving it: every human being, even those who in many respects are vicious, is yet desirous that right and justice, or what he deems justice, should be done. Now in this life, no one meets exactly his deserts; some get more perhaps than they deserve, but far the greater number certainly get much less than they at least fancy they deserve; and therefore there is in the secret heart of every man an ulcerated sense of wrong, which is only bearable if he thinks that finally all wrongs will be righted, but which becomes utterly intolerable, if it is believed that no such rectification will ever take place. Many and many a criminal, many and many a one who has ended his career on the gallows, has been in his heart convinced that, on the whole, he has been unjustly dealt with: not perhaps in the particular instance of crime for which he is at the moment suffering, but taking his whole career together.

I believe that there never has been a time when men were so determined to enjoy themselves; but I also believe that this desperate determination does in many cases arise from the feeling that beyond enjoyment, there is nothing to be had; that the deepest and noblest instincts of our nature seem to exist only to be thwarted and disappointed; and that therefore we may as well eat and drink, for to-morrow we die, and death ends all.

[illegible] of life be taken, there is little reason [illegible]ding or expression of thankfulness [illegible]least a sufficient harvest. This [illegible]ted on by thousands who [illegible]n name—precludes [illegible]r a curse than [illegible]be really wished, according to it, would be some catastrophe, some cataclysm, that should end at a blow the existence of a race which, whatever its achievements as a race may be, consists of individuals the majority of whom are and always have been preponderatingly unhappy; some of whom have been so unhappy that imagination, in presenting their case, turns from it with absolute affright.

It may be well now and then to look such things in the face, to analyse the draught of this life, and not merely to allow ourselves to be slowly and passively poisoned by the noxious matters contained in it, without realising the source of our wretchedness. Life in itself is simply wretched; no gift of a loving Being to us, if this life be all to expect. If we are, to use the coarse expression of an English female Atheist, to learn to dispense with such "cakes and ale" as the persuasion of a righteous God and of a life to come can give us, then, the sooner we all leave this world to what it would be without us, to what it once was without us, the better will it be for ourselves and the world. The inferior animals can get on without us quite as well as with us, if not better, seeing that men too often make an unwarrantable use of them; and for ourselves, when we have once for all resigned delusive hopes, and find that the higher we climb the less satisfaction do we gain; why, the best thing for us is to expedite the inevitable moment which will take us out of this phantasmagoria of baffled hopes and defeated conscientiousness into that nothing from which we sprang, into which we must sooner or later all return.

A Harvest Thanksgiving then—indeed the least feeling of thankfulness even to the blind powers of nature that have brought about harvest, the least feeling of satisfaction rather, since thankfulness to the laws of nature is an absurdity—is quite out of place in man, considered as a mere mortal animal, with curiously high powers and no corresponding future. "If in this life only we have hope" we have really no hope at all and as little ground for satisfaction. At least, each one will do well in that case, to make up his mind that he will abandon life so soon as he finds that it begins to go against him. A calculated suicide to be effected at the right moment, is the natural outcome of atheism or pessimism—for the two words are convertible terms.

Of course, I do not anticipate that this will ever be acted out on any scale of magnitude. Men cling instinctively to life, with a tenacity which it requires a good deal of thought or a great deal of suffering to loosen. And yet, one does hear in these days much more frequently of men's voluntarily quitting life; in many cases, not persons of peculiarly wretched lot in it; there are symptoms of a wide-spreading discontent and dissatisfaction of which the still comparatively few cases of self-murder are only more than usually significant signs.

It may be said, and my text rather leads up to

saying, that such were not the feelings of those heathen of old that knew not God: that the rains and fruitful seasons He bestowed on them filled their hearts with gladness as well as food. And this is very true: but it is true because they occupied a very different stage in the progress of thought to that to which modern unbelievers have attained. They knew not God, indeed, as we Christians have been taught to know Him; but they felt that the bounties of Nature, as we have now learned to call them, were kind gifts from some beneficent though unknown Power; and in the childlike simplicity of those days of happy ignorance, they believed that on the whole this beneficent Power had the upper hand, and would make things right at last. They had not (in general) reasoned out a deliberate conviction, such as now possesses many minds and casts its dark shadow over many more, that all is for the worst; they had not accepted this awful conclusion in the face of the testimony to the contrary given not merely by rains and fruitful seasons, but by the disclosure of a loving Father in the person of His Eternal Son. Living in a cheering climate, with few of those elements of misery from which the human race seems doomed to suffer most when most aspiring; surrounded by forms of beauty and given over to an existence in many respects little above that of the animal creation, which in those parts is so abundant and so full of life, the Lycaonians and ancient heathen generally acquiesced without demur in a state which they did not comprehend, indeed, but which did not puzzle them, because they did not try to comprehend it. When filled with food, and this they generally were, their hearts were filled with gladness. Their temptation was to unchecked sensuality: to a purely animal life. Ours is a very different one: it is temptation to the denial of anything beyond the purely animal life: a denial the more stubborn, and the more guilty therefore, because it is made in the face not merely of the very doubtful evidence of Nature, but of the clear evidence of historic Revelation.

The end of the whole matter then is this: that we should feel, deeply and strongly, that this life and all its blessings, such as they are—and I do not wish to underrate them—is yet nothing in itself to be very thankful for: that the words of our General Thanksgiving give the only point of view from which the feelings we are this day acting on can be justified. In it we "thank God for our creation, preservation and all the other blessings of this life:" but we do not stop there; we go on to say, "but above all for the means of grace and for the hope of glory." It is only as believers in another and a better life that we can be truly thankful for the gift of this life, and it is only as Christians, who have the means of grace, that we can have that hope of lory which exhibits this life in its true meaning and proportion. If this life be all, there is a dark porch, without a house to enter from it: a vestibule, painted with all manner of strange and apparently meaning figures, which leads into no Temple where all these mysterious things shall be explained: an apprenticeship, but to nothing, the denials and hardships of which are cheered by no expectation of future gainful usefulness. Life is an unhappy mistake of those primal atoms which have evolved it by some strange process without being themselves alive: existence a road downwards, beginning in rapture, ending in an abyss: the world, a marvel of adaptation without purpose, of contrivance without forethought: having no discoverable or permanent use, since it began to exist within a measurable period, like those who dwell in it, and like those who dwell in it will, in a measurable period cease to exist; a mighty maze, without plan, without result: a huge domicile of unrefined pleasure and pain, and of very refined misery and despair.

Such is life—such is the world—such is the universe—not perhaps to the young, who are just entering on their full powers, and have yet to find out how little true gratification they can get out of them: on whom the experience of this world has not had time to act. But such it is to all those who have advanced to any length in life and are no longer cheated by its first promises. Such is life—to all eventually, if life such as we know it here be all. But "thanks to God for His unspeakable gift!" we Christians have the clue to this strange maze, the key to this mystery of existence, at least so far as it concerns us to know it. The Gospel does not, indeed, tell us what the universe at large is, or what part we are intended to play in it; but it does tell us what this part of it is, and what we have to do in it. It tells us that God, not chance, has made all things, and that God has not made all things and all men in vain. It tells us what philosophers in the days when the words I am going to quote were written, could not tell—that this world is passing away; a remarkable declaration in which St. John is fully corroborated by modern science; but that he that doeth the will of God, and he alone, abideth for ever. This is what science cannot tell us; it is beyond its scope; for science deals only with the physical: the moral, the spiritual, are outside its domain. They use, or ought to use, and dominate it; for science requires being kept in its place; but it cannot ascertain *their* laws nor do anything more than act as their servant.

Let, then, the blessings for which we are this day expressing especial thankfulness, take their due place, and serve to lead us to those higher blessings without which they would, indeed, be only veiled curses. Were it not for the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, for the means of grace, and the hope of glory, we ought rather to be thankful, if thankfulness were not absurd, for any revolution that would extinguish life at once upon this planet, and save its inhabitants from the slow torture, the long agony of being pressed gradually out of existence by increasing

rigours of natural condition, the doom with which modern science threatens all sentient life—the life of man of course included—upon the earth.

The news flashed across the Atlantic yesterday—is it not a powerful corroboration of the drift of my discourse? And the fate of this good man—a man who had deliberately set himself to use the place in the whole world of probably the greatest real power for the high purpose of extinguishing political corruption in the most politically corrupt nation upon earth,—the fate of the late President of the United States is only one out of countless similar instances. Not to go beyond the experience of the present generation, the murder of a former President was another: the death, though not by murder, of our own Prince Consort was another. In these instances some malignant power would almost seem to have been visibly at work to remove those who could least be spared: to strike down the greatest and the best in the very acme of their powers and influence. The impartial visits paid by Death to the cottage and the palace are the stock-theme of moralising poets: but such events seem to cast a doubt on the impartiality of the destroyer. He seems to select his victims. With devilish malice he takes precisely those whom the welfare of mankind requires, and leaves the worthless, the mischievous, the disturbers of society, the outragers of law, the swindlers of a nation, to work out their miserable plots, and batten on their deluded victims in security. Such spectacles are too much for us: we cannot understand them: they are worse than unintelligible, they are absolutely intolerable without the Gospel to bring life and immortality to light. Nothing short of that can enable us to accept with patience, with reverent submission, what we cannot fully comprehend; to acquiesce in all the strange changes and chances of this strange world, as being only parts of an eternal purpose, the whole of which we cannot see; to take, not from the hands of blind chance, but of a wise and loving God, evil as well as good, knowing that in His hands evil itself shall be transmuted into good, and all the malice of the great Adversary, whose existence and power Christ fully recognised shall end in the final triumph of "whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are just." "This world is passing away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."

At the Chester Diocesan Conference on Wednesday, October 26th, a resolution will be moved by Bishop Kelly, seconded by Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, M.P.:—"That the Lord Bishop of the diocese be respectfully asked to appoint a committee to report upon the efforts that have been already made within or beyond the diocese for the prevention of the degradation of women or to recover the fallen, and to suggest such measures as may seem practicable for dealing with this great and humiliating evil."

"THINGS NEW AND OLD."

By the Rev. PREBENDARY CURREY, D.D., Master of the Charterhouse and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, Sept. 25th, 1881.

"Every scribe which is instructed (who hath been made a disciple, R. V.) unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."—St. Matt. xiii. 52.

THE 13th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel is a record of parables, some of which were delivered from a boat upon the Lake of Gennesareth to a multitude crowding upon the shore. This collection of parables is prefaced by a declaration of the purpose with which our Blessed Lord adopted this method of teaching, viz., to test the sincerity and earnestness of His hearers; it is accompanied by repeated exhortations to intelligent attention, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," and it closes with a description of what these parables might be expected to contain. While our Lord thus explains the principle and method of His own teaching, He indicates to His Apostles the manner in which they are to follow Him.

It was the special duty of the Jewish scribes to search the Scriptures and to expound the Law—and this duty they very diligently performed after their manner. They examined every letter of the Sacred Oracles, they fortified themselves by continual reference to the men of old, and that scribe was accounted the wisest who could adduce the greatest number of Rabbis on his side. But the scribe whom our Lord commended was one "which was instructed unto the kingdom of heaven;" or, as the words may be more literally rendered, "one which had been made a disciple unto the kingdom of heaven"—*i.e.*, "the Christian expositor"—who must, as our Lord tells us, "bring forth out of his treasure things new and old."

I. 1. To understand the way in which this is to be done, the Christian teacher must in this, as in all things, turn to the example of His Lord and Master. And we find that the teaching of Jesus was essentially new. New wine was provided for new bottles (wineskins). The disciples perceived this, for they wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth. The common people perceived it, hearing Him gladly, because He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes. The Pharisees perceived it, for it was His strange and new doctrines which exasperated them to conspire against Him, and bring Him to death. Words such as none other ever spake, works such as none other ever did, these were the credentials which He produced when He called upon all men to follow Him. And yet in His teaching our Blessed Lord constantly referred to old truths, and to the wisdom of ages that were past. He opens His new exposition of the com-

mandments of the Law with a reference to former teachers, "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old." These truths which from His mouth were so potent and so new were to be found in the writings which proceeded from the same source as these which He now delivered. The oldness of the letter invested with the newness of the spirit was indeed through Him from whom it came the very Word of God. Thus He could refer the rich young man to the old precepts of the Law as the guide of life, and startled him with a new application, "Sell all thou hast and give to the poor." The commandment of love was, as St. John describes it, "old and new;" old in substance, new in application. "Brethren, I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the Word which ye have heard from the beginning. Again a new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in Him and in you: because the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth." (1 John ii. 7, 8.)

2. Again, we remember that our Lord declared that He came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it; and so His life, and His death, gave a new significance to the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law. These ceremonies hinted and shadowed forth realities which until Jesus came were of necessity very imperfectly understood. The very rites and ordinances were exhibited in a new light. The glory of the former ministration was passing away, and the new ministration which was to remain became exceeding glorious. So the Sabbath was transfigured into the Lord's Day; Circumcision into Baptism (the circumcision made without hands); the Paschal Festival into the Holy Eucharist—each in one sense old, but in another sense glorified and new.

3. If we examine the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, guided by the Holy Spirit of God, we find the servants following in the track of their Heavenly Master. We observe, for instance, how St. Matthew in his narrative loves to unite the acts and sufferings of our Lord with the prophecies of old: "Then was fulfilled," or "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets;" the prediction and fulfilment were so closely bound together that in the historian's mind the facts seemed to be the effect or consequence of the prophecy. Again, what a light is shed by the Apostolical writings on the prophets of past ages; how much brighter than that which was vouchsafed even to the prophets themselves. Abraham, we are told, saw the day of the Lord and was glad. But with what degree of clearness Abraham saw this glorious vision we are not told, and it is certain that even the most gifted prophets fell short of the members of Christ's Church in their apprehension of that truth of which St. Paul speaks in the Romans: "Now to Him that is of power to stablish you according to my Gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." (Rom. xvi. 25, 26.) In this respect even the Baptist, greater than all prophets who had preceded him, was inferior to the least in the kingdom of heaven.

> Vainly they tried the depths to sound,
> Even of their own prophetic thought,
> When of Christ crucified and crown'd.
> The Spirit in them taught.
>
> But He their aching gaze repress'd
> Who sought behind the veil to see,
> That not without us fully blest
> Or perfect they should be.

And so it was of the present privileges of believers not of their future glory that it was said, "Prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see and have not seen them." (Luke x. 24.) And "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

Accordingly we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews a key to the ancient ritual of the Mosaic Law, which was certainly very imperfectly understood until the light shone from heaven to make all things new. Again, in the Epistle to the Romans, we note the development of the doctrine of Justification, as St. Paul was commissioned to deliver it. How new and how glorious is the light which shines from heaven in his inspired pages! We observe how he connects the new truths with the old records, how he again and again substantiates his argument by quotations from the Old Scriptures, "It is written," a phrase invariably applied to that which was written in the Scriptures of the Jews. Thus by the inspiring voice of Christ and His Apostles old things have passed away, all things are become new, and scribes "instructed unto the kingdom of heaven" have brought "forth out of their treasures things new and old."

II. But if Christ and His Apostles taught thus, are we at liberty to tread in the same paths, and to pursue the same method in new things as well as old? The Son of Man spake with direct and personal claims to reverent attention which belong to none beside; and Apostles, too, were guided to truth, and kept back from error in a degree far higher than any teachers who have succeeded them. And yet Christ set even in this respect an example which we are permitted, which we are enjoined, to follow. Nor was the privilege of searching the deep things of God confined to the immediate successors of the Apostles. And therefore while we receive with caution the teaching of those who have been less distinctly accredited, yet we must not deny that in later days, in our own day, the Holy Spirit still abides with men to guide them

into all truth, and enables them to bring forth out of the treasure which He provides "things new and old." Nor is there wanting, even in the present day, evidence of this progressive faculty in man.

1. Let us consider this with reference to that which is the special function of "every scribe," the exposition of the Scriptures. There never was a time at which more attention was bestowed on this subject; and contributions are continually brought in from every quarter towards an accurate comprehension of the Sacred Volume. The investigations of men of science, the labours of critics, the observations of travellers, the researches of antiquarians, are all being combined to add to our treasures, and although the enquiries are sometimes carried on with a too daring a spirit, yet still honest study, pursued with a desire for truth, is never entirely thrown away. The conclusions may be erroneous, and the facts mistaken, yet conscientious, earnest labour has its reward; and amidst the hay or the stubble we find grains of genuine gold to add to the growing edifice of Scriptural knowledge. The true scribe must try every spirit, and listen, with patience, though with discrimination, to every voice which professes to speak to him in the name of wisdom and of truth. Again, it is a further characteristic of the present day, that each acquisition of learning at once becomes common property; and although this often leads to misapprehension, surely it is no little gain. The true scribe must direct these studies, not discourage them. He must welcome all that adds to the interest of the Sacred Volume, and be glad to penetrate regions of thought which have hitherto escaped observation. Time was when the Bible was regarded as simply a book of devotions; and we were sometimes encouraged to open the book almost at random, and to find in the text which should first meet our eye God's message to the soul. There is some truth in this. The Spirit of God breathes throughout the sacred pages, and speaks with no common voice to the hearts of men; "Every Scripture inspired of God is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work (2 Tim. iii. 16-17). And we should indeed be losers if, in our admiration for the new learning, we should part with the old reverence of devotion. But if, with careful step and thoughtful heart, we approach this holy ground, how vast, how new, a treasure lies before us, to awaken our wonder and our love!

The advance of modern science has altered and enlarged our views of the process of Creation and of God's operations in nature; and few would wish to go back to the crude conceptions of an early age. Here there is unmistakable progress; and woe be to the theological student who shall shut his eyes to modern discoveries, or denounce them as inconsistent with the revelation of the Holy Scriptures of God. New light may dazzle the eye at first, but will, in the end, enable us to distinguish more clearly the objects on which we turn our gaze.

Again, he who can represent to us in more vivid colours the deeds and the circumstances of the personages portrayed in Holy Writ does something to help towards a more intelligent and spiritual comprehension of the letter of the Old Testament, and brings the history of ancient times within the sphere of human thought and human contemplation. We come to feel that these patriarchs and kings were true living men, and have their place in the Sacred Volume in order that from their lives and from their manners we may learn something illustrative of human modes of thought, human passions, human impulses, human virtues—for there is virtue in the midst of depravity—human strength and human weakness, examples to be imitated or to be avoided, which speak with no uncertain sound to the understanding and to the heart. Further, the very knowledge of topography, local traditions, and local customs, often enable us to obtain a clearer insight into transactions which are to our habits strange and unaccountable. It has sometimes been thought that we derogate from the honour of Sacred History, if we look too minutely into its particulars, if we picture to ourselves things and persons exactly as they once were, if we bring to our mind Abraham's servants, Abraham's cattle, and Abraham's tents on the plains of Canaan, as we see those of an Arab chief upon the same plains in the present day. But the fault, if fault there be, lies in dwelling exclusively on what is external and temporary, and losing sight of the spiritual and eternal. Under very different outward circumstances men may exercise the same faith, enjoy the same hopes, and look forward to the same rewards. *Their* estimate of the past is imperfect who interpret the outward events and character according to modern customs and ideas; but no less imperfect is *their* estimate who see in Abraham an Arab Sheikh, and nothing more—in the Tabernacle a tent for public worship and sacrifice without remembering that it was built under the direction of God Himself, with a significance which the writings of the New Testament alone enable us to comprehend. The actions of Old Testament heroes were real, but they were also typical, mysterious, and if modern research has thrown upon them new light, it has not lessened, it cannot lessen, their old dignity and glory.

III. But may we carry out this principle to *doctrine* and expect even here to bring forth new things? Has it not been said that to call a doctrine new is by that very appellation to pronounce it false? We must distinguish. The truth itself stands unmoved, independent of man's judgment, and therefore unchangeable. But our modes of conception, our modes of definition, they vary,

and therefore we cannot say even with regard to doctrine that there can be no advance and no discovery. Else we must suppose that the doctrinal truths of Scripture are all stated in unmistakable terms, which can only be taken in one way, and which none but the foolish can misunderstand. But this is manifestly not the case, though sometimes eager disputants will recommend their own opinions by such assertion. The genuine theological student, the instructed scribe knows better. He examines the words, he draws his conclusions. What are these conclusions but human, and therefore fallible? And if reason may enter upon this ground, and draw forth by rules of logical science truths hitherto undiscovered or misunderstood, may there not be other methods than that of logic of arriving at the same results, and even correcting, as by formulæ of verifications conclusions which were apparent but not real. Man has been endowed with spiritual faculties which he may by God's help improve, or by his own misuse deteriorate. Man has been endowed with a distinctive power of accumulating wisdom and knowledge, and so each generation enters upon the labours of the past, inherits treasures, whether natural or spiritual, that have been acquired and handed down by those who have gone before. And we need not hesitate to say that for that reason we are in some respects wiser than our forefathers. There may no doubt be deviation or retrogression as well as progress, and it by no means follows that a new mode of conception is better than the old. But we may humbly and faithfully believe that our spiritual faculties are capable of growth, and that we may, like Socrates, grow wiser, learning something new every day. I am aware that there will be differences of opinion as to whether this or that doctrinal conception is an advance or a retrogression, and there is some danger in adducing particular instances, lest we open the way to controversy upon the special doctrines to which we may refer. But we may, I think, safely mention views which have been subject to considerable variation in our own country, and to a certain extent in our own times.

Rest from ordinary cares and occupations so as to devote some definite portion of our lives to the service and contemplation of God is one of the earliest ordinances appointed for man. Under the Mosaic law this ordinance was hedged in by special enactments of Divine origin, but of a temporary character. As time went on these enactments were narrowed more and more by human additions, until they reached their climax in the subtleties of Rabbinical speculation, and even at times tied the hands of the Jews from making the necessary provisions for the defence of their city against the assault of besieging foes. Our blessed Lord introduced a new principle, substituting in the place of trivial and superstitious observances the maxim "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." In our own country we find at one period the old regard to the Lord's Sabbath gradually losing force, and then a violent reaction, brought about by earnest men, who would revive its honour by a recurrence to Judaical observances, long done away by the freer spirit of Christianity. This revival though not without its errors has impressed on our country the observance of the Sunday, which forms an important feature in our National religion. But in the course of time a truer doctrinal conception has grown up amongst us, and the more thoughtful are able to appreciate the sanctity of the Lord's day without the necessity of those minute and formal observances which were common with the earnest-minded Puritans of former days. May we learn to keep a firm hold of the ancient reverence without going back to former trivialities, and thus resemble the Scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven by bringing forth out of our treasures things new and old!

2. Retributive justice and the future punishment of unrepentant sinners is plainly declared in Holy Writ, and cannot be denied by one who admits the authority of the Bible. But the nature of this punishment has been variously conceived. The monkish delineations of bodily torments, on which, in past generations, some were accustomed to dwell, are now very generally in our day admitted to be revolting and inhuman. The milder spirit of Christianity has gradually modified our conceptions of this doctrine, and we dwell rather on God's infinite mercy, and are content to leave the solution of this awful mystery in the hands of Him who knows all and pities all.

3. To take another instance. It cannot be denied that the fundamental doctrine of the Atonement has been conceived and defined in various ways by doctors of our own Church, and it seems to me beyond dispute that the hard and legal doctrine of the wrath of the Father, appeased by the sufferings of an innocent victim, which was not uncommon in our Church some half-century ago, has given way or is giving way to a more mild, more spiritual, and more primitive doctrine, according to which the Incarnation is brought more definitely to bear upon the Atonement, and we are taught how Christ, by taking our nature upon Him, has so identified Himself with His true disciples that we are partakers of His sufferings. The doctrine remains, but the conception has been modified. Christ has died for us no less because we have died with Him. "If One Man died for all, then all died" in His death.

It must be added that many of the new views are in fact a re-establishment of older views. Upon this our Reformers were accustomed justly to insist, who strove to remove accretions of error and superstition by a recurrence to the pure and simple teaching of the Primitive Church. But we must not trust ourselves implicitly even to the Early Fathers.

Historically their testimony is invaluable—but we are not to suppose that they had an exclusive right to freedom of thought and speculation. Religious truth does not consist in a series of propositions, whether gathered carefully from the earliest writers, or elaborated by the scientific argumentations of philosophic Schoolmen. The Schoolmen did their part, in many respects a noble one, though often on a wrong track. They and others like them accumulated stores of learning, of thought, of spiritual knowledge, giving to each generation some advantages not enjoyed by that which preceded it. The teachings of the course of Providence, of legislation, and of history are intended to bear fruit. We may, and often do, misunderstand and misapply them, but if in a reverent spirit we endeavour to read their lessons aright, we may humbly hope that, though marked by imperfection and marred by infirmity, our labour will not be in vain. There are even in our own day men of scientific attainment, and philosophical power, to whom has been given not only profound learning and conscientious industry, but also spiritual insight into the deep things of God. They, like the well-instructed scribe, will bring forth out of their treasures things new and old. Let us listen and learn.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1881.

IN response to "An Irish Curate," we will briefly detail some of the consequences of the terrible contagion, which doctors have, perhaps wrongly, named syphilis (from σὺν and φιλέω), for it is a disease not necessarily incident to the indulgence of the sexual passion; because medical men, accoucheurs, nurses, children and others, who have actual contact with the affected, are frequently inoculated by it. It was unknown before the Siege of Naples, A.D. 1495, and seems historically to have been "the noisome and grievous sore which fell upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and which worshipped his image." (Rev. xvi. 2.) It is a specific contagion, and assuredly was not and is not generated, as is commonly supposed, by promiscuous intercourse. Unlike temporary and passing blood-diseases, such as small-pox and scarlet fever, it, like the leprosy of old, clings to a man and his seed for generations, and must, we think, be dealt with after a similar fashion. Its effects on the person who first contracts it are well known, and were admirably portrayed in the passage we quoted, August 6th, from Shakespeare. They consist, as he says, of ulcers and loss of bones, nodes or swellings on the shin bones, sore throats and loss of voice, white, scaly eruptions which hoar the flamen, loss of nasal bones and consequent falling-in of the nose, and loss of hair. But its effects on innocent wives and children, not recognised in Shakespeare's day, are so melancholy and harmful, morally as well as physically, that they have induced us with deep seriousness to press this grave matter on the attention of Churchmen. We utterly repudiate the idea that this disease is the "natural penalty" of fornication. This sin was rampant in the world for three or four thousand years without producing this so-called "natural penalty." It is the natural consequence of in any way touching one who has the leprosy. The wife who breeds to a husband, who may have had it twenty years before, gets it, and the children either perish prematurely in the womb, or, if born alive, pass through the disease and commonly die of its effects under the name of Water-on-the-brain, Marasmus, Liver Disease, Bronchitis, &c.; or, in case they survive, they spend a miserable life, often a burden to themselves and the rest of the community. The grandchildren become a prey to scrofula, consumption, paralysis, and insanity. It has been estimated that this one disease supplies about one-third of the patients to the Metropolitan Hospitals for diseases of the Skin, Throat, Eye, and Ear; to the institutions for the treatment of Scrofula, Deformities, and Consumption; to the hospitals for Epilepsy, Paralysis; and to the asylums for Idiots, Lunatics, and Incurables. If this be true, and we believe it is, surely all true Christians ought to try and stay, if not stamp out, such a fearful plague.

NECESSITY OF A FUTURE STATE.

The following article was written by the late President Garfield at the age of 23, when in college, and was published March, 1855, in the *Williams Quarterly*, a magazine conducted by the students of Williams College, Mass., U.S.A.:—

"To no subject does the human mind address itself with such anxious interest as to that of its own destiny. The ponderous tomes that fill the world's libraries, the numberless dissertations upon man and his surroundings, and even Divine revelation itself, may all be comprehended in these three words: the *whence*, the *what*, and the *whither* of man. Indeed, the two former of these are only preliminary to the last. The soul instinctively inquires, 'If a man die, shall he live again?'

> Shall spring ever visit the mouldering urn,
> Shall morning e'er dawn on the night of the grave?

"The far-reaching sagacity of philosophers and the subtle reasonings of metaphysicians have been brought to bear in investigating the philosophy of a future state, and by the analogy of Nature superadded to

the testimony of Divine revelation they have laboured to show the rationality of a belief in such a state. Many of these works, though justly admired for their profundity, yet fail of affording to the common mind convincing evidences that life is but the preface to a boundless existence.

"We shall aim in the present article to deduce some evidences of this truth from the conditions and relations of human society. It has been truly said that man lives longer at the present day than in any past age. Not in years, for he has but a poor inch of time for his earthly inheritance; but he lives longer in action than ever before. What a world of events is now crowded into threescore years! Genius has triumphed over the elements of nature, and has almost annihilated time and space, so that the modern schoolboy of twenty has accomplished more than the antediluvian of half-a-thousand years. But there is one power that man has failed to overcome. Let his daring genius soar to the heavens, and visit the secret chambers of the thunder's home, and let his hand of power upturn the solid mountains, and level the deep valleys, yet be he lofty or low, he must fall before the hands of the Great Destroyer. The Roman poet has beautifully said—

> Pallida mors æquo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas,
> Regumque turres.

It is a startling fact that nearly two-thirds of the human race never know what it is to live. One half die in infancy, and but a small proportion live out the allotted period. Why is this, we ask? Are the plans of the Almighty thwarted? Ask that mother as she bends over the corpse of her child, which lies like a sleeping infant before her,—ask her if Divine goodness gave that precious treasure, only to tantalise her by tearing it so soon from her heart, and her soul will respond, "God is wise and good, and I shall again clasp my child in the land where shadows never darken, and the light never fades." Perhaps the lovely sister, who stood by our side but a month ago, lies in the earth—a lifeless clod—the blue mould on those sweet lips that so often spoke words of tenderness and affection—and the earth-worm rioting on that heart which so lately beat high with hope and happiness. And is this all of her? Have the designs of her all-wise Creator been fully accomplished?

"We see that everything in the three great kingdoms of Nature has a manifest design, and accomplishes the end for which it was created. The earth supports the various forms of vegetable life, which, in their turn, afford sustenance for the countless orders of the animal creation. All these contribute to the maintenance of man, the most dependent of all terrestrial beings. They can attain, each to its own perfection, without the aid of man; but his very existence depends upon them. For what, then, is man designed? Is it that he shall be nourished by the bounties of earth—the weak, helpless being that he is—to bask for a brief hour in the sunlight of existence, catch a glimpse of creation's beauty, feel the unsatisfied longings of that spirit within him for something beyond his reach, and then sink down into that dark oblivion, where beats no pulse of life, for ever? If this be so, then is life but a bitter mockery, and creation a splendid failure.

"Could we, in our day, make the circuit of our globe, and behold the varied conditions of its millions, what a mingled picture would be presented to our view. Yonder is Africa, the mourning garment of the world, lying in sorrowful darkness, and we shed the tear of pity over the oppressed children of Ham that have so long groaned in bondage. We would witness with astonishment the degradation of the myriads that inhabit the vast regions of Asia, and the isles of the sea, and on our homeward journey we would meet on the wild shores of the Pacific the few lone survivors of that dying race that once roamed joyful and free over all the Western world.

"And why this difference of condition? Shall one nation thus drag out a sorrowful existence, crushed and dispirited, while another glories in its downfall, and flourishes by its decay? If death is the boundary of man's existence, how can the Ruler of nations dispense justice? But let us take a nearer view. We see one individual born to a life of slavery, and from the first moment of his existence to the hour when he slumbers in the tomb, his soul and body are in servile bondage to his fellow-man, upon whom the richest blessings of life have been showered without measure. Another is the child of poverty, and is destined to toil on, through all his weary pilgrimage, for the bare necessities of life, and with his mind unenlightened by the genial rays of science, and his spirit unblest by an hour of happiness, he drops wearily into the grave, with no friend to shed a tear on the green sod above him; while another, born to affluence, and surrounded by all that the heart could wish, stands high in the world's esteem, lives honoured and beloved; and when at the close of a long life he sinks to rest, a nation is his mourner, and the lasting marble commemorates his fame. Again, a murder has been committed. Lying slander fixes the suspicion upon an innocent man. False witnesses testify against him. The only voice that would proclaim his innocence is hushed in death. The law pronounces his sentence, and he is hurried to a felon's grave, with the maledictions of society resting upon him.

"What, then, is the voice of all this testimony? Does it not proclaim that if a just God rules in the heavens, there must be a state of existence beyond this life, where these thousand wrongs will be righted, where the claims of injured innocence will be vindicated, the slave be unfettered, and the power of the oppressor broken, the loved and lost be restored, and the designs of Infinite Wisdom accomplished?"

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—There is no need for me to write any more on this subject, certainly not to "A Surgeon," whose notions of logic are without doubt different from mine. It is natural for medical men to wish to extinguish disease, indeed it is their duty in their own line to do it; but I, on a scientific view of the *human world*, *prefer* that the disease with its penal consequences should continue, as far as law is concerned, unless some penalty is substituted for it to restrain the sin; just as I prefer that prisons should continue as long as there are thieves to be put in them. And I do not want the law to step in and say, We will imprison thieves who damage society by taking large sums, but that no theft shall be punished until it has been proved to be a real damage to the person stolen from. I *do not* say that it would be wise or possible to pass a law

against prostitution (though I believe common decency might be enforced by law, and all cases of *detention* in bawdy houses and kidnapping severely punished), but I do say that until it is possible to inflict a penalty on some grades of prostitution, at all events, I view with abhorrence the removal *by law* of the natural penalty. Those who ask *for law* on the one side have no business to sneer at those who ask *for law* on the other, *or, as I do*, that law shall not interfere at all, unless it interferes to check the trade. "A Protection of Prostitution Act" is to me appalling. And that is what the present Act is in the moral world. I write this to explain to you some parts which you seem to have misunderstood in my argument.

October 3rd, 1881. E. T.

SIR,—Allow me to thank you for the testimony of your leader of the 1st inst., in favour of the remedy I suggested for checking prostitution and its attendant train of evils. And may I say that if the State may tamper with the marriage law by forbidding some to marry, she may equally relax it in the opposite direction, and allow a plurality of wives. Further, if the State robs thousands of girls of the chance of the monogamic bond, it ought to leave them free to accept if they will the condition of polygamy. There are also cases which often occur, known to every medical man and clergyman of experience, in which the law of monogamy works intolerable evils. Here is a case:—A man's wife suffered long from an internal disease. He, failing to divest himself of the "animal" part of his constitution, seduced his servant maid, who had soon to go forth with his infant, miserable herself, and a source of untold evil to others. He was soon forgiven by women quite as readily as by men, and a "pure and innocent" woman was soon found quite willing to occupy the place of the departed wife, a place to which her less fortunate sister had, I think, a prior claim. Monogamy, it seems to me, entailed hardships upon that man and that maid, and upon the infant, and also on those who suffered through the after-life of prostitution to which the victim devoted herself. There was sin in the case no doubt, but was it not a case in which exception to the general rule might have been righteously made and much evil prevented thereby?

It was not David's polygamy nor Solomon's for which God was angry with them, but the murder and adultery of the former, and the idolatry of the latter. Having already become one flesh with Bathsheba, David took her when released from her bond to her husband, Uriah, by his death, and the Lord blessed the union, however wickedly it had begun. Nor can we look upon polygamy as a very wicked thing, seeing that God Himself gave David the wives of his late master, tone down as we will the force of the words of Scripture in regard to the matter. It is hardly right to look upon such as David as being necessarily gross and beastly, and indifferent to the dignity of women. Nor can we truly allege that David and Solomon, and the people they ruled were barbarians.

It appears to me that instead of grasping, Eve-like, at a condition above that which God has assigned to women, they ought rather to learn "to be in subjection," hard as they may find the task to be. Highly laudable would it be for them to do all in their power, though the effort were to be made with some personal loss to themselves, to raise their fallen sisters to respectability, and to save tempted ones from ruin and infamy and a life entailing misery on multitudes of people. A brother cleric refers me to the family troubles of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to show the evil of polygamy. Let me refer him in turn to the greater trouble in Adam's family. Does this trouble show the evil of monogamy? My good brother's argument proves too much. It is worthless.

I think with another correspondent that the hint about limiting the number of children, or having none, at pleasure, savours somewhat of "The Fruits of Philosophy." I hope the correspondent who has introduced this matter does not mean what his words seems to convey.

Destructive evils like prostitution require sharp remedies, and I do not think it a thing to be ashamed of to take counsel as to the best way of grappling with them. It seems to me, too, that all pertinent suggestions ought to be fairly argued without passion and without personalities.

CLK.

THE ART OF SPEAKING AND READING.

BY THE REV. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.,
VICAR OF BRIGSTOCK.

(Continued from page 71.)

Our last paper was on the "key-tone." We did all we could, not only to enable our readers to understand what it was, but also to appreciate and apply it. We hope our efforts were not in vain, and that good results will follow. Of this we have no doubt, if only there be a little determination and perseverance. More depends on the forth-putting of energy than we are disposed to think. The general view is that it is all owing to genius. This is true; but most of all is it owing to the genius of work. *Labor omnia vincit.*

We shall be occupied in this and the following papers with the principle of word-grouping. We shall explain it and its rationale, and show how to apply it.

The painter, when he transfers his conception from his mind to the canvas, carefully arranges his figures. He has a due regard to their relative importance. He gives to the chief figure, whatever it may be, the most important position. The others occupy places of greater or less subordination. The grouping is a great point. This is not all. He is careful to make it clear not only where each figure begins and ends, but also that every part of each is well defined. The figures do not run each into the other, and the parts of all are clearly marked. This is more or less a mechanical process, and is independent of the colouring. The colouring is a thing apart.

The musician is no less clear in the expression of his ideas. The beginning and end of each phrase is clearly and well marked. It is true that with many compositions of the present day it would be difficult to distinguish any idea; but this does not alter the fact that many have, and many others again have had ideas, and have expressed them accurately and clearly.

As with the painter and musician, so with the speaker. He must so express his ideas that they may be easily understood and appreciated. The beginning and ending, as well of the whole as of the several parts, must be well defined. For this he must understand the principle of "word-grouping."

We have something analogous to word-grouping in words themselves. The letters whereof long words

are composed fall into natural groups. We call these groups syllables. Let us illustrate this. Take, for instance, circumlocution, and see how the letters fall into groups. We have cir-cum-lo-cu-ti-on. We have not only this mechanical division of long words into groups, we have something more. The syllables are not all of equal importance. We need not explain the principle of accent to our readers. We only ask them to notice it and its operation. The transition from it to word-grouping is easy. If words were read without any attention to accent—the stress of the voice on particular syllables—the English language would lose its characteristics, and—may we add?—its charm ; yet how much is read without any regard for this principle of word-grouping ! Words may not be intended to represent ideas ! The fact is not regarded, and words are run each into the other in such a manner as to render it necessary to perform the operation of assorting and rearrangement to acquire any sense of what is meant. The writer has often imitated the sounds he hears, and Spanish has been the result !

Words are the speaker's tools. He uses them to express his ideas. Words are not absolutely necessary to the expression of ideas. We must remember this. To express ideas by words is only the speaker's mode and manner of doing it. Words do not always mean the same with all minds. If words were the only means of expressing ideas, the occupation of the painter, sculptor, musician, and others besides, would be completely gone. If, again, words were *absolutely* necessary to the expression of ideas, there could only be one language, and mistakes would be impossible—"a consummation," perhaps, "devoutly to be wished." The German is not obliged to name his idea of a horse in the same way as an Englishman, or an Italian in the same way as a Frenchman. How far we are indebted to language for the ideas we possess it would be difficult to say ; but this is a very different question.

Ideas may be and are expressed without the use of words. This partly appears from what we have said above. We may illustrate it further by a little anecdote. It is said of Mendelssohn that he once made a tour in Scotland. When he returned his sisters asked him to describe what he had seen. He said, "I cannot do it in words, for language would fail me ; but I will do it on the piano." With this he sat down and described Scotland with the tones he brought out of the instrument. This story may seem a little far fetched, and yet the music he performed is still extant. And then it will, perhaps, be admitted that Handel meant his "Hallelujah Chorus," his "Harmonious Blacksmith," and his "Water Music" to describe exactly the ideas suggested by their respective names. It by no means follows that, because many play without any, the remotest intention, of evolving or giving expression to ideas, and many composers write without any perfect conception, there is no truth in the observation that the musician's art consists in the clear and accurate expression of ideas. Much that goes by the name of music is nothing of the kind. This does not, however, alter the fact that much that is music is the embodiment of many ideas ; no more does it follow that because many words are uttered which convey no ideas, language is of no use for this purpose. Our point is here, the speaker must recognise that language has a well-defined end and object, and must act accordingly.

The speaker, then, must do two things, (1) conceive accurately ; (2) express clearly. To do (1) he must observe. He must exercise mental vision. To do (2) he must apply the principle of word-grouping. And all this he must do whether it be in speaking or reading. The ideas must not only be clearly marked as a whole, but each part must be distinct.

We shall take up, explain more fully, and complete what we have to say on the principle of word-grouping in our next. Our object in these papers is to be concise. Our readers will observe that we do little more than indicate the lines of thought. It would be quite possible to write very much on all our points. The fear, however, in such a case would be that they would be lost amongst the clouds. We try, therefore, to suggest, humbly, of course, that although this paper is short, there is something in it to think about. Meantime we shall be concerned to put what we have to say in an intelligible form.

(To be continued.)

Reviews and Notices.

"A New Analogy between Revealed Religion and the Course and Constitution of Nature." By "Cellarius." London : Macmillan and Co. 1881. Pp. viii., 295.

If the title of this anonymous volume, and the adoption of the Latinized form of Bishop Butler's name "Cellarius" as the writer's pseudonym, suggest at first a somewhat presumptuous attempt at rivalry with the author of the immortal "Analogy," a perusal of the treatise will show that it is the work, not so much of a rival, as of a disciple who reverently borrows his master's method and style, and endeavours to adapt his argument to the advanced thought of our age. Accepting it in this sense, the first thing to be noticed is that it puts the famous argument from analogy to a use which is radically different from that for which Butler unfolded it. In his hands its office was to clear away difficulties, and make room for the positive evidences of religion, rather than to be of itself a direct proof that religion is of God. The Deists whom he addressed acknowledged the divine origin of nature, but denied that of religion, because of certain things in it at which their reason revolted. Butler's retort was to the effect that precisely similar things were to be found in nature itself, and if in spite of these they believed nature to be of God, it was grossly inconsistent to found on their counterparts a rejection of religion. Thus the analogy between nature and religion was used to remove the alleged difficulties which barred the way to a fair consideration of the evidences for religion. But in the "New Analogy," the resemblance between nature and religion is made the direct and chief proof of the divine origin of religion. Whereas Butler's contention was that the analogy disposed of the objection that religion could not be divine because of the difficulties which it presented to reason, "Cellarius" maintains that the analogy by its own force proves Christianity to be divine. His argument comes to this, that Revelation, running all through in a line parallel to that of nature, based on the same principles, adopting like methods, and directed to substantially identical results, must in all reason be ascribed to the operation of the same Author or Cause.

It is obvious that this use of the argument from analogy demands a much closer resemblance between nature and Christianity than was necessary for Butler's purpose ; and the difficulty is to make out satisfactorily

this higher degree of correspondence. For at first sight it can scarcely fail to recur to the mind that a supernatural dispensation resting on the stupendous facts of the Incarnation, atoning death, glorious resurrection, and assumption into supreme sovereignty of the only Begotten Son of God, must be something so utterly apart from the course of nature, as hardly to bear comparison with it at all, much less to resemble it sufficiently to indicate clearly and convincingly the handiwork of the same author. To remove this impression, and exhibit points of resemblance sufficiently numerous and strong to bear the weight of the argument, is accordingly the chief business of "Cellarius"; and he certainly conducts it with great ingenuity of thought. His first step is to manipulate, to some extent, the two things to be compared. The one he stretches, the other he contracts. Nature is to stand for everything which we learn from experience, whether in the physical, intellectual, or moral worlds, including therefore natural religion, which with Butler is placed on the opposite side of the comparison. On the other hand Christianity is to exclude Christian doctrines and institutions, and to be reduced to that which is accepted by all Churches and sects, "the historical manifestation of Christ" recorded in the Gospels, or in other words "the events of the New Testament history." What the scheme is which is thus to be compared with the scheme or course of nature appears from the following passage:—"Let the following then stand for the meaning in which Revelation will hereafter be used: That God, out of love to the world, sent His Son to live the life of man in it; that the Son addressed Himself to the task of saving mankind from their sins by a life of perfect virtue and holiness, by the performance of benevolent actions through the power His Father had entrusted Him with, by the teaching of a perfect and efficient morality, and perhaps, above all, by that instruction concerning the Father and His relations towards His (no longer creatures but) children, which we receive as of binding and absolute authority; that in the performance of this work He was put to death and raised from it—the effect of these great transactions being to afford a certain means of redemption from sin and death to those who accepted Him as their Saviour; that by virtue of these events He is solemnly, and in the face of all men, instituted King and Judge of mankind, with each individual member of which He is brought into personal and spiritual communion; finally, that the Christian Church was instituted as the means whereby all the blessings His work confers may be appropriated by His disciples and carried on to those who are not yet His people."

The two schemes being thus defined, "Cellarius" proceeds to work out, in successive chapters, the analogy between them. Generally, they are capable of being compared; they combine readily; they co-operate together; and this is true of no other religion than Christianity. Both appeal to all the three kinds of testimony; "evidence of each man's own senses, of competent witnesses, of effects or appearances from which we infer the existence of certain causes or conditions." The information given by them is similarly limited; as Nature stops at the sun which "plays the part of mediator between the Creator and His creatures," so Christianity stops at Christ; "we stop at Him, as in Nature we stop at the sun." In both the unity of God is at last proclaimed, after "a long and unceasing struggle against the polytheistic spirit." Both declare the love of God, and the reign of law. Both leave to man moral freedom. The life of Christ, excluding His miracles and Resurrection, was "a purely natural human life," both in its physical and moral characters, and "realised absolutely Nature's ideal"; His whole teaching was in harmony with Nature, never contradicting anything whether in the physical or moral sciences, that reason has discovered. His redeeming work resembles the course of nature, not only in being "a progress or development from a lower stage of existence to a higher," but also "in respect of the disease to be cured, the incapacity of the sufferer to save himself, and the kind of remedy proposed." The means of Redemption, the self-sacrifice of Christ, is but the culminating instance of the natural law of victory by self-sacrifice, according to which "the violent races perish and the mild survive." And lastly, as all natural societies or communities have an internal life or spirit pervading them; so Christ's Society, the Church, is animated by the Holy Spirit, which produces a "moralising effect" on the members, and may be defined "simply as every influence that the Revelation through Christ of God's attributes, relationships to us, methods and intentions, could bring to bear upon the minds and hearts of those who joined the heavenly society."

From this sketch it will be seen that the treatise is particularly free from a theological complexion, and that its subject is practically the Reasonableness of Christianity. The impression which it leaves on the mind of the reader will probably not be quite so deep and vivid as the writer anticipates. We should say that while the points of resemblance, which are so carefully worked out in this "New Analogy," all help to dispose the mind towards the Christian Revelation, they still fall far short of constituting a proof of its Divine origin, and are no sufficient substitute for that sovereign evidence which is found in the response of man's spiritual nature to the voice of God in the Gospel of His Son.

The *Gloucester Chronicle* states that the Dean of Wells (Dr. Johnson) is lying dangerously ill at Weston-super-Mare, and the greatest anxiety is felt for his condition.

The *Newcastle Journal* states that a gentleman of North Northumberland has signified his willingness to contribute £1,000 to the new bishopric fund on condition that "Lindisfarne" be prefixed to the title of "Newcastle." The Bishop would then go to the north as seventeenth Bishop of Lindisfarne and first Bishop of Newcastle.

The Rev. Canon Bartlet, who has been vicar of St. John's, Mansfield, for nearly fifteen years, is about to resign on account of his health, having been ordered a year's rest by his medical advisers. He will be succeeded at St. John's by the Rev. Thos. Luffman, vicar of St. Peter's-at-Gowts, Lincoln, on the nomination of the Bishop of Lincoln, who is patron of the living.

The preachers in the Chapel Royal, Savoy, for the remaining Sundays of October are as follows:—16th—morning, Rev. C. Croslegh, chaplain of the Royal Indian College, Cooper's-hill; evening, Rev. R. W. Thompson, assistant-chaplain. 23rd—morning, Rev. Dr. Thornton, vicar of St. John's, Notting-hill; evening, Rev. E. C. Hawkins, Head Master of St. John's Foundation School. 30th—morning, Rev. J. W. Festing, vicar of Christ Church, Albany Street; evening, Rev. Canon Knollys, chaplain of the Chapel Royal, Whitehall.

The Church of England Pulpit.

DIVIDED ALLEGIANCE.

By the Rev. E. C. HAWKINS, M.A.,
Head Master of St. John's Foundation School, Leatherhead.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, Sept. 25th, 1881.

"No man can serve two masters."—St. Matt. vi. 24.

FOR the first time since they escaped from Egypt, the pressure of the invisible world was brought to bear on the Jews by the preaching of the Saviour. They had been degraded there by the selfish terror or the selfish hope of a future to which all life was subordinated, and their nature had to be braced and purified by a moral code which insisted on the infinite value of *conduct*, and for the sake of raising the estimate of this life kept out of sight for a time the motive of another. Prosperity and adversity took the place of the heaven and hell of the Egyptians, and the idea of them before long became as degraded and as degrading as the superstition of their captivity, and meant to the majority of the people nothing higher than poverty and riches. The Pharisees laughed at the youthful enthusiast who preached against the service of Mammon. They, if any one, were safe in their knowledge of the Scriptures, and may well have seen something almost sacred in the wealth which seemed a mark of the favour of God; and may easily have blinded themselves to the fact that it was the sign and not the favour that they were seeking. They did not discern—it would not be safe to say that they have discerned yet—that the denunciation which offended both their secular and religious prepossessions was the herald of a change in the centre of gravity of the world, for with whatever exceptions of gold-fever or of speculation, the possession of wealth has never for any long time been the *summum bonum* of any Christian people; so that for far the greatest part of the history of Christendom a preacher would probably have been beside the mark who assumed that money was of necessity the rival divinity, or that one of the masters who divide allegiance of men must be inevitably Mammon. This country is thought by many observers to have passed within the last few years out of one of these occasional periods or phases of absorption in the pursuit of the visible means of enjoyment and of power, and to have reached a stage in which different ideals present themselves for devotion and attainment. Whatever may be the force of this hidden desire for wealth lying below the surface of more pronounced ambitions; however slow we may be to believe that such a seemingly permanent instinct as the desire to *get*, is extinct or even torpid, there is no doubt that it is not the longing that is in the air now; that the hopes and schemes, the aims and aspirations that meet the eye and the ear in every society and in every print nowadays are not what they were. The idea of the acquisition and ownership of property has ceased for a time to be in sole possession of men's hearts; the idol Mammon is dethroned, and other, we may say higher, objects of love and ends of life have taken his place in their minds and their affections. Even among the mercantile classes themselves there are indications of this transition. Many circumstances may have combined to bring it about, and in considering them, the difficulty arises of distinguishing between the causes and the symptoms of such a change of feeling. The experience of the instability of commercial prosperity in the last few years, the suggestions for reflection offered by the discordant relations of masters and workmen, the diminished value of land—the great symbol of wealth in this country—owing to repeated bad harvests, these may have opened many minds and made them more receptive of the new spirit which was undoubtedly abroad before the way was prepared for it in classes which, without these predisposing causes, would have been slow to welcome new gods and to distrust their old religion. But the signs of the change are unmistakeable. Men are visibly hankering after a solution of the problems of life; they are making sacrifices hitherto unheard of in the cause of private and national education; they are trying to find a basis of agreement between capital and labour; between almsgiving and political economy. New discoveries seem to expand the area of life, and to open an endless vista for interest and for inquiry. The worship of culture, however fantastic in some of its developments, is only one form of the noble longing to know, and is in itself a new and distinct ambition. The passion for art, though not unaccompanied with a sensuous reaction, has replaced more sordid affections, and made an outlet for feelings dammed up or degraded before. The great change in the political equilibrium, by which power is transferred to the majority, has diffused the restlessness of the thoughtful classes more widely among the people; has brought nearer a new departure in legislation, and the possibility of realizing many dreams for the improvement of society. The extent and freedom of theological enquiry, questioning the origins of all rites and all churches, and examining into the history and authenticity of all documents, while it has tended to disturb the beliefs that rested on the scaffolding of truths, and could not distinguish between the spirit and the form, has on the whole fostered a robuster faith, and has been a powerful

element in bringing about that transfer of allegiance from the seen to the unseen, from matter to spirit, from narrower to wider aims which are the prominent characteristics of contemporary thought and feeling. And all these movements have been accompanied, or rather preceded, by a vigorous revival in religion. Almost for the last two generations, public worship, which was not much in fashion before, has been a distinct interest to very many among the more influential classes in society, and has penetrated to the upper strata below them. It has not been confined to one party in the Church, or to the Church itself, but has made itself felt in all persuasions; and there is good reason to believe that the feeling has not exhausted itself in the details, or in the emotions of public worship, but that the standard of personal holiness and piety has risen if not in proportion to the increased interest in Church services, yet in a very considerable degree. No more hopeful symptom could be imagined of the varied intellectual, social, and spiritual movements of the day, than that they should have followed upon (may we not say sprung from?) a religious revival. Some of them seem to have issued in stark antagonism to all religion, natural and revealed, some to be entirely beside it; some not to have been saved by it from grotesqueness and reaction; but it may at least be said that not one of them set out with aims inconsistent with the morality of the New Testament, or preached the gospel of Mammon, or set up an epicurean view of life, or suggested that we should not trouble ourselves about the masses, or said in any of their many formulæ, "Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die." On the contrary, as is well known, all these movements have had some high aim; truth, beauty, refinement, liberty, have been the attractive images which have won to their shrines the men of our generation; while in many instances their aims and processes have been more practical and more distinctly fashioned after the type of life of Him "who went about doing good." Many of the schemes which occupy the brains of the thoughtful and consume the strength of the active are solely concerned with the most distinctly Christian of all work, viz., doing good to men. Some, inspired by the new religious impulse, are trying to communicate it to the masses, who as yet show no sign that it has reached them; others, who are yet untouched by it, are active workers in the special duty of the religion they cannot accept. Many students in science, and literature, and art, restored to the impulse almost unconsciously, and in lives less directly but no less really devoted to the general good, exhibit the fruits of "faith in ideas," which is the strength, or, as some would say, the weakness, of this generation. It is a good omen for the future of Christianity that it can inspire such energies; that it can acknowledge, and, even in a sense, embrace them all; that in a race with a destiny like ours, it can exhibit this pliancy of adaptation and this comprehensiveness of view side by side with, if not as the product of, this new-born zeal for its doctrines and services, and this new-born interest in the person and work of its Founder. But though Christianity may originate and countenance all these varied manifestations of its spirit, no one of them, nor even all of them together, can complete its ideal or satisfy its exactions. Though it is far from likely that Christ would charge the men of this generation with the special sin of Mammon-worship, it is very probable that He would find it necessary to remind us, too, that "No man can serve two masters." Mammon is not the only god of a man's idolatry, nor "the lust of the flesh and the pride of life" the only bars to Divine Communion. Every one of the generous energies and refined pursuits of this eager age has its own risk. Politics may degenerate into party spirit; and free inquiry may be tempted to become destructive; and culture may be found to be no restraint upon passion; and art may become pagan; and benevolence may fail in sympathy. These are their specific dangers; but besides these, and common to them all, the enthusiasm for truth and beauty, the benevolence (which is the virtue of our day), create for all men who believe in God the danger of divided allegiance. Our very earnestness becomes a stumbling-block in our way. The sense of usefulness and the consciousness of disinterested motives seem security enough, and no fear is felt of living quite apart from the region of the Spirit while carrying out His work in the world. The atmosphere of Christianity and the example of Christ-like men are the inspiration of such work, and seem to guarantee its sufficiency as a spiriualt service of God; the worker turns aside from his charities, or his art, or his investigation, and dwells for awhile, in hope or in regret, in the Divine presence; but how few of us live there! The purity of the chosen pursuit is sanction enough for the life we lead; it seems *all*—a more or less direct service of the Father; we seem to have an assurance that we have one only object of devotion in the very attempt to serve two. It is one of the many higher difficulties of life, this difficulty of reconciling the claims of the contemplative and the active life—of the mystic and the practical Christian. On a superficial view it seems as if duty to God was fulfilled when men do their duty to their neighbours; as if this relation of serving God through service of men were the only one in which we stood to any living intelligence. But apart from the confession of the being of God which we make by taking part in the public worship, the power over our lives of the unseen motives to action is a striking, though little noticed, suggestion of the existence and operation of an Unseen Inspirer. The great majority of the reasons for action and for abstention that rule all the nobler sort of lives, are spiritual reasons, and are in themselves a

witness that we stand in such a direct relation to their Author that devotion to Him of all that is within us ought to be as immediate and conscious as the response of the heart to the motives. The difficulty is not removed by this acknowledgment; it remains as hard as ever, in spite of all probabilities and in face of undoubted conviction, to carry out into the world the communion of the closet, to realize in the midst of work the Presence that seemed so near, to escape the snare of making the work its own end, to transform it into a service of the Master who, we feel, has inspired it. So the man and the work alike suffer; he, even if he suffer no other loss, is uneasy and distracted with the consciousness of a divided aim, with the endeavour to keep his two supreme interests and relations in equilibrium; with the possible suspicion of personal deterioration side by side with growing perfectness of work, and of public usefulness. And for the work, it would not be hard to show that the characteristic faults of every form of intellectual and social activity suggest this origin. They seem to proclaim that they have arisen to disfigure and to defile exalted work, because it has been done, consciously or unconsciously, for its own sake, and not as a sacrifice to God. Some of the defects and excesses of good lives and of refined employments have been mentioned; there may be others, but, whatever they are, the licence of modern criticism makes it impossible that the most typical instances of them should be unknown. Where they are flagrant they point the moral of the Saviour, and show, in their plain effect on the worker and his work, how soon the penalty of a slighted warning falls. It is easy to criticise—to point out how this artist has become careless of everything but money, how this charitable agent has become hard and cold, how this poet has become affected, and the other gross; how the preacher has become vain, and the politician a partizan. But it is less obvious to discern in each failure the alienation of a spirit from the Father of Spirits; to trace the impurity or drought of a stream to its severance from the source; to mark in each separate instance the operation of the law of the degradation of all work as soon as it is made an end to itself. And it is a less welcome task to note its application to the humbler aims and obscurer energies of our own lives, to find in them the same failure and the same deterioration, the same want of power to satisfy the exactions of conscience, and, in ourselves, the same want of spirit to go on; and to be obliged to confess that they were prompted at first and carried on so far by desire to please or to excel, to give vent to energy, or to make a name—not taken up as duties of obedience to the spirit that works within us, both to will and to do, and laid down as sacrifices at His feet whom we acknowledge as the Master of our destiny while we refuse Him the homage of our brain and of our heart. Something more must be due to Him than occasional worship, public or private, if amid the preoccupations and activities of life we are not to exhibit, each in his own life, one more failure of the attempt to "serve two masters." The failure arises not because the aims are incompatible; not because it is impossible to serve God through the devotion of life to a great pursuit. Such a double aim, if it can be called double, is not a moral incompatibility, like the endeavour to combine social exclusiveness with theories of Christian brotherhood; to maintain spiritual without social communion; or to combine high sacerdotal pretensions—in the sphere of religion—with the principles of equality in the region of politics. The aims of those who would serve God and their calling, too, are not at opposite poles like these; they are in line, but one is beyond the other, and men stop short at it. It is hard, or perhaps impossible, to say that the service of God must be the *conscious* aim of all honest work; for any noble ambition redeems a life from the idolatry of self, which is His only genuine rival—to His worship. But just as worth is dwarfed and palsied which has no high object—so are the honest workers, who toil on without the enthusiasm of a personal service, robbed of their natural stimulus; they see no end to effort, they begin to look for results, and the unexpressed conviction, in various forms, at last possesses them, that as spiritual beings can have but one origin, they can have but one end—to labour and to feel *for and with* the great Inspirer of all energy and thought. Life is robbed of its force and spring, of its "sweetness and its light," without this conscious devotion of its strength; and ennobling as all useful work is, the history of individual experience in all the paths of human industry would confirm the Saviour's prophecy that "no man can" be slave to it, and at the same time give his highest service to God, for he cannot do it in the spirit and with the perfection of which both he and it are capable; it is less than he has to give, just because it becomes the task of a slave, by being done for its own sake and not the "service of perfect freedom." If the Saviour's warning is a verdict against the endeavour to think and to live for self alone, and, at the same time, to stand well with Heaven, it is a caution, also, and a sigh over the unselfish toilers who miss the vigour of giving sustaining work, which is a free-will offering to God. If individual lives demand this single aim to direct their efforts, to support their will, and, amid the discouragements and failures of life, to keep alive their love for men, such a definite object must be immeasurably more necessary to harmonize and to concentrate the independent and diverging activities of a vast and complex society like ours. Now, it seems more than ever men want common objects, common ground, and simple guidance; there is energy in abundance, but little harmony of action, and little concentration of force upon recognised be-

neficent ends. Schemes of all kinds are in vogue, and each man believes in his own till it fails him from inherent weakness or want of external support; and then we faint and flag, and fall into a fatal unbelief in all unselfish effort, and come to think that there is nothing better for a man than to make life easy for himself and smooth paths to walk on till he dies. Those who believe in God, however little they live with Him, must be sure that the thought of Him can alone give that tranquillity which is the first condition of all high work, and the guidance which can alone make it effective—can alone give hope to those who are sick with frustrated schemes, can restore nobleness to those whose aims are sinking in the atmosphere of the society they live in, and inspire fresh love into those who are growing mechanical in benevolence. It is a common-place of religion to believe all this; but to have found it true in personal experience is to have felt one's self a living unit of the great human society whose creative genius is the mind, and whose animating principle is the will of God.

THE LAST MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT.

By the Rev. W. B. PHILPOT, M.A., Vicar of South Bersted, Bognor.

Sermon Preached at South Bersted on Sunday, Sept. 25th, 1881.

"That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love."—Col. ii. 2.

IN these days, when a great event happens in the world, all the intelligent inhabitants of the world, generally speaking, assist. We are not altogether as our fathers were, nor as we ourselves were in earlier days. We more clearly belong to the higher and wider order of beings. Man as a race is now more quick and powerful. There is more fellow-feeling in mankind. Whatever may be the case with individual men, "the world is more and more," and mankind at large is coming to realise its unity. The kingdoms and states of the earth are in some senses more United States—more "knit together in love" than ever before. Just as persons, who have been kept apart, dislike each other in their reciprocal ignorance, but begin to like each other better as they know one another more, so it is with peoples: except with those who form a sort of outer-court civilisation, or who have no civilisation at all; and even these are being swept against their will into the dance of common interest. The heathen are becoming more manifestly the inheritance of the Son of Man. The divine music of God's Will is with low swell winding itself into the furthest circles of humanity, and those populations who now sit sullen and remote in the corners of the banquet hall will in their turn start up, will hand-in-hand swing themselves into the movements of higher forms of being, and will be ordered by the Divine Spirit into gracious ways of life.

Nothing is more pleasant than to watch the modes by which the Truth makes men free, and knits them together in love, except it be to note the fact that it is so, and to cherish the hope that it will be so more and more. When that organ was in building, with what interest did we watch the advancing work. We saw its stops, its pipes, its keys, its source of air, and all its parts gathering and growing into power of sweetest sound. The beautiful instrument was at last made; its patient potentialities were ready to break from their dumb material condition; and now all that we hoped for has come to pass. We hear "the very pulse of the machine," as it renders forth melodious and full discourse at the touch of the musician, accompanying, leading, and heightening the hymn of the choir and the praises of the congregation. In like manner this is what the Spirit of God is doing with the world. Humanity is God's organ. He is building it up so as to sound forth in His own good time the music that He composes, and the hymn that He has for it. Already He brings some of its stops into play.

To drop metaphor, look what He is doing even now in the world. Here are great peoples far apart in respect of space. Owing to some mistake a century ago in Home Government—the undue pressure of a tax upon an article of general consumption—our American Colonies broke off into flat rebellion against our Crown; and in a war, which was a war between brothers, they rent themselves rudely away from us. They abjured our very modes of government. They set up a State, and then a system of States, wholly alien to the ancient modes of this side of the globe. And yet, while the vindicators of their own freedom, they maintained towards dark-coloured races that slavery which the more advanced of our European States had long abandoned. Not many years ago they fought another civil war over this, and the result was that slavery disappeared from among them. This, too, was a great step in the Kingdom of Christ. That also cost the life of a President. Now look again how the champions of Christendom prevail; and that at a moment when least expected, and by a means which of all others seemed the most unlikely. Up to July the 2nd there were terrible quarrels among the leading men of the States; quarrels about principle, conflicts involving the very organism of the constitution; disputes in which each would have it that the others were traitors, enemies to the Republic. The very purity and honesty of politics, whatever there was, seemed likely to be lost in this national pyæmia. For a very poison of place-hunting seemed to be rioting in the veins of that vast community. Most men sought their own and not also others' good. So noisome a leprosy of selfishness was coursing through the natural gates and alleys

of the body politic. Indeed, it became sadly clear to thoughtful men that a day was at hand when the States would be united no more.

At this juncture a man had been prepared by Providence, and happily chosen for President, such as I need not try to describe to you. Have not all your daily journals made you familiar with his rise, his progress, his virtues, his works, his struggles, his in-born, God-given energy, and the crownless crown to which his right ambition led him? At this very crisis, when such a man seemed to short-sighted mortals essential to the triumph of his cause, the welfare of his country, and the staying of that virus in the nation's blood, a half-mad assassin, inflamed and bewildered by brooding over imaginary wrongs, driven into the worst and last insanity of crime, caught, it is too probable, by the contagion of European Nihilism, sprung from that heterogeneous population; and on the 2nd of July, in an unguarded hour, when his victim was least suspicious of danger, discharged shots at the President, which on Monday last, alas! proved to be deadly.

Now mark the results; mark how beneath all political passions, all which seemed given over to wild hatred and indiscriminate selfishness, this crime has knit together the whole American people in a unity of horror and of love, by which all those dissensions of the States have been drawn together and healed. So that whatever course they may now take, it is most unlikely that the principles of their murdered President will be forgotten or displaced. Already President Arthur, beside that mangled corpse, has solemnly and religiously promised that it shall be so. Nor would he on any other condition be tolerated by that great Republic. That which perhaps not even a Garfield could have done by his life, has been thus done by his death—as by some Samson who in his fall drags down with superhuman strength the pillars of Dagon. The self-sacrifice, and the purity of his character are striking themselves into his fellow countrymen much in the same way on the national scale, as the self-sacrifice of the Master of all humanity is, on the world-wide and time-long scale, saving by degrees all society and all humanity. So marvelously does God bring good out of evil. By so obvious a law in the working of His heavenly leaven does He use crime itself as an instrument for arresting crime, and for the promotion of the saving health of a people.

With what affectionate feelings these States have been standing at their President's long death-bed during these eleven weeks of his suffering, united in a sense in which they never were united before. That never before in the history of mankind have a people had the opportunity of learning so great a lesson from their ruler. Such was his manly nature, his splendid endurance, and such, let me add the faith and courage of his noble wife. Never was a President's message more effective. We had in some sort a like experience when our own beloved Prince Consort, and then our Prince of Wales lay between life and death, between death and life. Nor has England forgotten the interest, the sympathy, and the gratitude which then we learned. By the mercy of God, that experience ended in the latter case in recovery and thanksgiving.

But the lesson across the water has been deepened by death, and our own Royal widow, the Prince and Princess have been the first to voice their sorrow to that desolate home, and to those fifty millions of fraternal people, along the nerves of language which underlie the deep. Her heart has been moved, and the heart of the people as the trees of the wood are moved by the wind. Another act has been done by our Queen, a little one in itself, but yet one which America will remember as a great one. She ordered a wreath of flowers to be offered from her own most gracious hand as a token to the living and an honour to the dead. What a tender and delicate act it was. The thousands who hastened and crowded to weep with those representative travellers on that long journey of death and honour, over plain and hill, saw that wreath of Victoria resting on the bier. If any other ever was, that immortelle will be immortal. The memory of the fragrance of those funeral flowers, which has been wafted through that land, will methinks, prove sweeter than any sulphur, and all the fumes of war. From those blossoms will be distilled a dew from which will breathe all the kindness of England when she who sent them is gone—gone, which heaven for the world's sake delay—to the everlasting kingdom. Never went a sweeter message from a Queen. Let us dwell for a few moments on this beautiful idea of human unity amidst human variety. With the exception of France and Switzerland there is no other Republic in Europe. Even the new nations which have arisen in modern history have held to the ancient type, and have either chosen to themselves kings, or allowed kings to be chosen for them. But just as over yonder all the internal differences of that one nation which more especially suffers, have been laid aside and forgotten, and in the presence of that horrible crime and in the death-chamber of that great man have been laid aside and made of no account, so it is with all the principal nations on this side of the world. All the members of Christendom suffer with them. Though the Ruling Houses of Europe who wield these old nationalities abhor from their hearts, and dread beyond measure the very idea of a Republic—though they feel and know that all the elements of danger among their own subjects lie in this very direction—yet there is hardly one of them, however despotic, however attached to their own ideas of statecraft, but in this hour have a kindly word to send of human sympathy. They and their people with them, by State messages, by incessant writings in

all their journals, of whatever shade of politics, have been, so to speak, all of them American in their sorrow for Garfield, in pure regard for this great, simple, honest ruler, and in sympathy with his nation; and that, I repeat, although he was the choice of a Republic.

Science, we thankfully own, is a gift of God. It is He that teacheth men knowledge. How could men know anything, how could men contrive anything, were it not for that indwelling power of the Divinity which guides us into all truth? We commonly, indeed, regard the achievements of science—notably of this new science of electricity—as ministering to the national needs of commerce and the communications of business-men. But see how God can vindicate science as His own chosen avant-courier for the higher welfare of His beloved creatures. Note how He uses it to promote the Kingdom of Jesus — that kingdom which is righteousness, kindness, and peace. There is something, I had almost said, of a divine pleasantry in the manner in which the great Magician of the universe can take those same wires—which commonly flash to and fro nothing more important than the rise and fall of stocks, or the intrigues of "corners"—and use them for His own sublime ends: to silence enmities, to check political passions, to bring into action the kindliest emotions, to allay prejudices, to bind together distant and alien nations, to express the best feelings of kings and peoples, to unite all in abhorrence of crime and in love of honesty and truth—in a word, to prove Himself in His own hour and way, the ground Landlord of the globe, and the one immanent influence in the human race. See how kindly Heaven can catch mankind in this network of science. Far as the West is from the East, see how He can make His lightning give shine unto the world, from the East even to the West, to comfort the hearts of humanity, as if time itself already were no more.

We ourselves in this little village form but a very little part of the English nation—but we do form a part; and, I doubt not, you have all taken your part, and felt your part, through this sad crisis, so that what I have said has been, I am well convinced, an expression (though I know too feebly put forth) of what we must all feel at one of the most remarkable events which have come into the round of our experience. The Dead March of our voluntaries rolling from our organ to-day, and the bell tolling from our spire to-morrow will voice our part in this mighty sorrow with which the planet is now trembling all over. Let us all pray that the mourners may be comforted, especially that lady who has set so noble an example to the wives of the world. Let us pray that the American people—our brethren and kinsfolk—may by this great trial be sobered and steadied in their great experiment of modern history, in the endeavour to live in their chosen form of government for the good, not of a part, but of the whole community, and for the glory of God. Let us pray that our European peoples, and our own beloveed England, and herein more especially our Queen and royal family, may be guarded from the like dangers, and that we may be bound together in love for our living sovereign as they are for their departed president.

And while we pray for the unity of peoples, for the averting of wars, and for the growth of the Kingdom of Christ in this nation and in the world at large, let us first and foremost see to it that our own natures be all brought under the same gracious influence, and that we pass through our "little while" on earth with our own inner elements of spiritual rebellion reduced to order by the mastering and unifying love of our dear self-sacrificing Redeemer. For this to each of us, as well as to His own people, is the last message of the lost President.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1881.

AS "An Irishwoman" has accepted our challenge, and endeavours to prove in our present issue that polygamy is opposed to the teaching of the New Testament, it behoves us respectfully to examine her arguments. We cordially thank her, "An Irish Correspondent," Miss Bewicke, and other ladies for their valuable assistance in discussing this terribly important question; because we are convinced that women, with their pre-eminent influence on real education and all other social matters, are able and ought to take the greatest share in preventing this immorality and its grave consequences which we all so much deplore. "An Irishwoman," without quoting passages, infers that, as a wife in the New Testament is always spoken of in the singular, therefore there could have been only one wife. This to us is by no means conclusive, and we would remind our correspondent that as the Greek language had no indefinite article, but used the definite article in an indefinite sense, so in our translation "the wife" often stands for "a or any wife." She says we may accept Matt. xix. 5, 6, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," as a command. Certainly, but it is a command against *divorce*, the subject on which our Saviour was

speaking, not against polygamy, a totally different subject. Syphilis and other diseases prove pathologically that husband and wife are one flesh, and ought not to be cut asunder save for adultery. Then in verse 9, our Saviour defines adultery: "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." Our correspondent says this implies that it was the custom to put away one wife before taking another, and that our Lord implied that whosoever did not put away his wife before taking another in addition, committed adultery. We believe that there was no such custom in existence, but that polygamy was at that time one of the Jewish social institutions; and if it was His intention to condemn it, He would have used the words we have suggested. The inference to be drawn from 1 Cor. vii. 2, "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband," may establish the equality of the sexes, but it certainly does enjoin marriage and does *not* condemn polygamy. We think it favours it, for in a community like ours, where the women are so much in excess of the men, it would be impracticable under monogamy for every woman to have a husband. In other passages St. Paul restricts only Bishops, Elders, and Deacons to one wife, so that it is a fair inference that he allowed a plurality of wives to other men. Surely the first Council of the Church would have condemned polygamy if it were contrary to the teaching of Christ. The fact is that there seems to be no direct teaching on the subject, so that it is lawful to adopt whichever system is most expedient.

CHURCH CONGRESS.

"The Claims of the Revised Version of the New Testament to General Acceptance."

By The Ven. EDWIN PALMER, D.D., Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford.

These claims rests on two foundations—(1) the need of a revision, and (2) the character of the revision which has been completed within the past year. Why was a revision necessary? For two main reasons. First, because the Authorised Version was made from a Greek text of inferior quality. Secondly, because in many respects it is not an accurate translation of the Greek text which it represents. Other reasons may be added, but they are reasons of less importance. For example, some words and phrases in the Authorised Version have become obscure by reason of disuse. Again, the names of Old Testament personages appear frequently in their Greek form, and are not recognised by the unlearned reader. Noe, Elias, Eliseus, Osée, Esaias are instances; above all, Jesus for Joshua. No doubt it is a real advantage to read, as we read in the Revised Version, of Noah, Elijah, Elisha, Hosea, Isaiah, Joshua. It is a real advantage also to exchange the phrase, "I know nothing by myself" for a phrase which actually conveys St. Paul's meaning, viz., "I know nothing against myself;" or, to take another instance, the phrase "guilty of death" for the phrase "worthy of death." In both of these cases the Authorised Version is unintelligible, if not misleading, to a modern ear. It is an advantage again, to read no longer of a multitude of ships on the lake of Tiberias, of two ships sunk, or well nigh sunk, by a single haul of fish, of Our Lord teaching from a ship the crowd which had gathered on the shore. But few persons, I imagine, would have consented for the sake of small gains like these to disturb a version justly dear to the ears and hearts of all. The only grounds on which such a consent can reasonably be asked are the two grounds which I named first—the inferior quality of the Greek text which the Authorised Version represents, and the imperfect accuracy of that version as a version. If these charges can be substantiated, men who believe in Revelation must needs be dissatisfied with the Authorised Version. No purity of English idiom, no felicity of rhythm, can atone for defects like these. To a Christian the Bible is not a collection of poems or romances, the value of which depends on style and diction: it is a collection of narratives, precepts, arguments which he believes to contain a message to him from God. He cannot but desire to know as exactly as possible what God has spoken by the mouths of apostles and evangelists. If he can read Greek, therefore, he will seek for that Greek text which comes nearest to the original. If he cannot read Greek, but must needs read the New Testament in a translation—nay, although he can read Greek, if ever he does read the New Testament in a translation, he will require that the translation shall represent the best Greek text, and shall represent it as accurately as possible. It is alleged that the Authorised Version is founded on an inferior Greek text, and is inaccurate as a translation. I will take first the charge of inaccuracy. I hold it to be undeniable that in many particulars the Authorised Version does fall short of accuracy as a translation. I will mention two notable instances. In Luke xxiii. 15, it makes Pilate say, "Lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him." It is difficult to conceive what Wiclif and Tyndale and Tyndale's followers—for it runs through all the Early English Versions—understood by this rendering; but it is certain that the Greek words mean, "Nothing worthy of death hath been done by him." In Acts xxvi. 28, Agrippa is made to say, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian"—a translation which is utterly inconsistent with Greek usage. Few cases, perhaps, are to be found in which the inaccuracy of the Authorised Version is so plain as it is in these two. But there are many cases in which a want of minute attention to points of language—it may be a want of minute learning—has caused it to obscure the meaning of an Apostle or an Evangelist. In the translation of so peculiar a book—a book intended "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," it is not easy to be content with anything short of the closest possible approximation to the original utterances of our inspired teachers. I am not impugning the general accuracy of the Authorised Version. For that, as for other excellencies, it deserves the high place which it has gained among ancient translations. But I submit that general accuracy is not sufficient in a translation of Holy Scripture. I can imagine, however, that the amount of inaccuracy which is found in the Authorised Version might be

thought insufficient, if it stood alone, to justify a demand for its revision. But it does not stand alone. Beside it stands another defect more palpable and more momentous, to which it is time that I should recall your attention. The Authorised Version, in common with all the Early English Versions (except those which were made from the Latin Vulgate), represents a Greek text of an inferior quality. The Greek texts of the New Testament printed in the sixteenth century (on which Tyndale and his successors relied) "were founded for the most part on MSS. of late date, few in number, and used with little critical skill. Nearly all the more ancient of the documentary authorities have been known only within the last two centuries." Moreover, there is no small amount of discrepancy between the more ancient of the documentary authorities and the MSS. which were used by Stunica, Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza. Time would not permit me to go into detail on this subject, if I possessed the necessary qualifications. Sufficient for my purpose is the notorious fact that every critical edition of the Greek Testament which has appeared in the present century exhibits a text very different from that which is reflected in the Authorised Version, and of which the Greek Testaments in common use among us, derived from the editions of Stephanus and Elzevir, are familiar representatives. Cautious critics, as well as those who are bolder, admit in many instances the unsatisfactory character of that which has been called, since Elzevir first used the phrase, the *Textus Receptus*. If the difference between this text and the texts found in modern critical editions lay only in such matters as the order of the words, the omission, addition, or interchange of conjunctions, and the like, critics might probably get scant hearing from the general public, though the sense is often materially affected by such variations as these. But when it is seen that the received text is condemned by a great *consensus* of critics in passages which have been used by authors like Bishop Pearson to establish important doctrines, and which must continue to invite such use so long as they stand unaltered in our English Bibles, it is impossible to rest satisfied with a version which represents that received text. I will give two examples only, but they shall be examples of the first importance. One is the famous text of the three Heavenly witnesses (i. John, 5—7). the other that verse in the First Epistle to Timothy (i. Timothy, 3—16) which exhibits in the Authorised Version the words, "God was manifest in the flesh." In both of these cases the *consensus* of critics is remarkable. Not only do Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, and Hort omit in the first case all mention of the three heavenly witnesses, and in the second case substitute the relative pronoun for the word Theos, but the same course is taken alike by Dean Alford and Bishop Wordsworth in their commentaries. And in the case of the First Epistle to Timothy I find the Bishop of London in the "Speaker's Commentary" on the same side. The Epistles of St. John have not yet appeared in that commentary, but I cannot doubt what it will say to the reading which introduces the three heavenly witnesses. Can it be satisfactory that the New Testament which we read in our churches and put into the hands of those who know no Greek shall represent a text which contains spurious or ill-supported readings of such a character? I might add, if time allowed, other cases, only inferior to these two in importance, besides a host of minor imperfections. I base the need, then, of a Revision primarily on the fact that the Authorised Version represents an inferior Greek text, and secondarily on its occasional failure in accuracy as a translation of that text which it represents. Let me say, however, at this point, plainly, that whatever inferiority may be attributed to the Greek text represented by the Authorised Version, whatever inaccuracy may be attributed to the Authorised Version as a translation, it is not suggested for a moment that it is an untrustworthy guide with regard to the great doctrines of our religion. On the contrary, I desire to state most explicitly that the New Testament teaches the same theology and the same morality in the Authorised Version, and in the Revised. More than this, no Greek text which is honestly based on documentary evidence, no translation which is honestly conformed to the rules of language, can make the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists preach another Gospel than that which the Church has taught her children for more than eighteen centuries. But although one Version may teach the same doctrine as another, it is the duty of the Church, as "the witness and keeper of holy writ," to place that holy writ before the eyes of men in a form which reflects the original with the utmost precision and clearness that is attainable. I turn now to the work of the revisers. As it has been my privilege for the last eight years to share their labours, it would not beseem me to come forward either as their critic or as their panegyrist. I will attempt rather to state their aim and the character which they have desired to give their work, than to estimate their success. It has been their aim, in one word, to revise both the Greek text and the English translation thoroughly. Let me speak first of the Greek text. The revisers have not put forth a new edition of the Greek Testament. "It did not fall within their province"—I am quoting the preface to the Revised Version—"to construct a continuous and complete Greek text." But in every verse, from the first verse of St. Matthew to the last verse of the Revelation, they passed under review every variant which had a fair show of authority and seemed to have any possible bearing on the translation, and determined, according to the best of their power, on which side lay the preponderance of evidence. The readings which they adopted, in preference to readings followed in the Authorised Version, have been set out carefully in editions of the Greek Testament published for that purpose at Oxford and Cambridge. The number of these readings is very large. It will be observed that they are often concerned with points so minute as to be incapable of affecting the sense. I call attention to this fact in order to illustrate the thoroughness of the work. It was thought better to correct the Greek text in points where correction might seem unimportant, than to run a risk of leaving it uncorrected where correction might possibly be, or even seem to be, of importance. It will be observed, again, that the readings adopted by the revisers are not always those adopted by Lachmann, or by Tischendorf, or by Tregelles, or even by Westcott and Hort, although Westcott and Hort were themselves revisers, and by their kindness each of their colleagues had their text beside him in proof throughout the work. There were amongst us textual critics of different schools, whose names are well known to the learned world. When they agreed, those of us who had not made textual criticism our special study followed their consentient voice. When they differed we deemed it our duty to

ask for a statement of the evidence and to decide between them. It was our desire not to follow blindly the lead of one or more individual editors, but to amend the text so long "received," wherever, and only where, there was a distinct preponderance of evidence in favour of such amendment. I come now to the translation. Here, again, our aim has been completeness. Indeed, the fact that it was our special business to put forth a revised English text, and not a Greek text, naturally led us to give to this part of our task a minute and scrupulous attention, for which the other part did not call in an equal degree. We examined again and again every verse from end to end of the volume. Our first care was to conform the translation to any new Greek reading which we had adopted; our second, to correct erroneous or inadequate renderings where we had adopted no new reading; our third, to remove such archaisms as tended to obscure or distort the sense; our fourth, to secure, as far as possible, in parallel passages, or passages in which there was no difference of meaning, a uniform rendering for the same Greek word. In striving for completeness, I doubt not that we have pushed our efforts beyond the limits of public expectation. Men who have not themselves tried their hands at the work of revision, are apt to think that it may with advantage be limited to the removal of important blemishes. And these, again, they expect to find few in number. "Why should this or that word," they say, "be changed? Surely it can make little or no difference to the sense?" Even revisers, before they face their work, are often victims of the same delusion. When it was prescribed to the revisers of 1611, that they should "follow the ordinary Bible read in the Church (commonly called the Bishop's Bible) and alter it as little as the truth of the original would permit," no one probably dreamed of the multitude of minute alterations which were made by them. When a rule modelled on this old rule was laid down for the revisers of the present day—I mean the rule that they should "introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorised Version, consistently with faithfulness," the same dream floated before the draughtsman's mind. I do not believe that any man of learning and judgment, who, sat down by himself to revise the Authorised Version, would find that his task corresponded to such a dream. He would find it difficult at the outset to define an important blemish. If he defined it narrowly, he would soon be sensible that he was trifling with his task; if he defined it loosely, it would soon cease to be a guide. I venture to think it a merit of the revisers that they have not construed the rule in question slavishly. The conviction forced itself upon them at an early stage of their work, and grew in strength as that work went on, that if the Authorised Version was to be touched at all, it ought to be made in all points as true to the original as their utmost powers and utmost exertions might avail to make it. Its outward garb indeed was to be kept unchanged. They accepted this rule with hearty goodwill. Ancient words and phrases, ancient grammatical forms—so far as they were still intelligible—they were glad alike and careful to retain. It was their study so to execute their revision that neither language nor rhythm should fall on the ear with an unfamiliar sound. Of course this was not always possible, but I venture to think that in this respect no small measure of success has been attained. The English New Testament has not been modernised. But when it was necessary to choose between sound and sense, between truth and elegance, the revisers have not hesitated in their decision. Antiquity cannot make error or obscurity venerable. To the reverent student of Holy Scripture felicity of rhythm and accuracy of translation are things incommensurable. The revisers have desired to put the English reader as far as possible on a level with the Greek reader. To this end they have given him in their text the most exact equivalent, in their judgment, of the Greek words which was consistent with the English idiom. To this end also they have placed alternate renderings in their margin, when they deemed them such as the Greek words might not unreasonably suggest to one who could read Greek. I rest the claims, then, of the Revised Version on these two grounds:—the necessity for a revision, and the thoroughness of this revision. It is not for me to estimate its merits. Ten years may have been wasted by a body of men chosen out to do this work. I have no fear that this has been the case, although I am of course sensible that in so vast a mass of detail there must be blemishes for critical eyes to discover. But I will say, in conclusion, one word for our work, the truth of which I am confident will be admitted by all who study the Revised Version carefully. I claim for our work that it has been done fearlessly, without consideration of individuals, or of parties, or even of the divisions which have broken the outward unity of the Church. No consciousness of strong feeling within our own body, no apprehension of passion or prejudice outside, has been suffered to overpower our deliberate judgment. We have not retained traditional readings because they had been used to support the doctrines of the Church, we have not retained traditional renderings because they were agreeable to modern fashions of thought. I am claiming a rare freedom from disturbing influences for the body to which I belong, I cannot but think that the composition of that body made it easier for us than for the individual critics or commentators to escape such influences. We were a numerous body. Number shields individuals from the impact of hostile criticism. We were a body composed of diverse elements; diverse in cast of mind, in educational training, in religious communion. We were a body—I speak boldly because what I am going to mention does not apply to myself—which contained in it not a few of those who have won a place by their writings among the foremost textual critics and exegetists in this nation. These features in the composition of our body were our safeguard. A smaller body, a less mixed body, a less distinguished body, could not have failed to approach the task with more timidity and with more partisanship. The work was one which needed to be done without fear or favour, if it was to be done at all—in the fear of God only, without a thought of the judgment which this or that man, or set of men, might pass on its execution.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Once more I am constrained to write; and as I have to touch on more points than one, I trust you will have patience to hear me through to the end. As a rule shame and obloquy is the portion of those women who take up this subject. They meet with

the abhorence of their own sex, and the contempt of the other; but the harvest truly is plenteous and the labourers few, so few that even women can't be spared. We would work silently if it were possible, but silence has never carried any measure yet. Women must descend into the turbid waters, in the hope that perchance they by any means may save some. I think the teaching of the New Testament is very plain in reference to marriage, for wherever a wife is alluded to—as living in those times—it is invariably in the singular, and in the sense of being only one wife. These allusions to one wife are too numerous to quote, and are, I think, as forcible as a command; for it seems to be taken for granted that Polygamy is a bygone state. However, we may accept Matt. xix. 5 and 6 as a command. From verse 9 it appears that it was the custom to put away one wife before taking another; but our Lord condemns even that custom, instituted in barbaric ages. There is only one inference to be drawn from 1 Cor. vii. 2: "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." Here man and woman are placed on an equality; it is preposterous to suppose that there is one set of moral laws for men and another for women. In some countries, where Polygamy is in vogue, men go a step farther, and believe that women have no souls! The whole spirit of the New Testament Scriptures seems to strike against the fundamental principle of Polygamy; it is certainly entirely at variance with the sublime spirituality of Christ's teaching, and that of His Apostles. We are told that to be "carnally minded is death," to "crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts," to "make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof," etc. I think all that has been said against it in your issue of 1st October still holds. However great a "deterrent," I, for my part, can only regard it as legalized incontinence, which it would be, in the sense of making provision for such beastliness as that related by "Clk." last week—the evil in the instance introduced consisting in the breach of the moral law, not in the law itself. It would be expedient for men to learn to keep "the body in subjection" before they preach the subjugation of women. The suggestion, that it would be virtuous to keep seven hundred wives after the manner of Solomon, makes one wonder if the writer is not a Rip Van Winkle, who has been asleep since that time, and unconscious of the advance of civilization during the interim. Many acts of barbarism are related in Old Testament history; but it does not follow that men's deeds are God's laws, as may have been supposed by the writers of an unenlightened age. It is the New Testament with which we have to do, it being the later and more transcendental revelation; in forsaking its teaching in order to adopt the practices related in the Old, the writer is guilty of a theological mistake, be he Theist or Christian, should the latter incongruity be possible. Finally, I would refer him to the statistics of crime if he would see how far beyond women men are in some respects; and however we look at it, it would be a loss to men's highest and best interests. It is often woman's province to help men onward in the path of reform; the nobler and more cultured she is, the better for those around her; lessen her position, and you will lessen her incalculable influence. The Editor cannot know all the Mormon laws, some of which read plausibly enough. There are means of escape open to Mormon women which are not admitted to Turkish wives. What has been said about the latter being treated with kindness and respect really goes for nothing, for in the most evil conditions of things some masters have been kind and indulgent to their dependents; but the "law was not made for the righteous man, but for the sinful and disobedient," to deprive them of the *power* of doing harm. It will not do to defend an unjust measure by recommending the oppressed to throw themselves on the tender mercies of human nature. The Turks carry out to perfection the ideal health system of the supporters of the Contagious Diseases Acts. They are a tall, straight-limbed people, with gazelle-like eyes. But what of their mental growth?—and they have had plenty of time for development. Where their men of genius in science, in philosophy, in statesmanship? They are not to be compared in culture or intellectual capacity with either the English or Americans; their sensual mode of existence has weakened their mental calibre and rendered them devoid of moral or ideal sublimity. The Contagious Diseases Acts are based on a fallacy, and cannot be productive of general good. Immorality is encouraged by putting no restriction on men's action, by making healthy vice a national institution, and the health of the most abandoned the especial care of the State. Vice is sanctioned amongst men, the most dangerous class, because the most numerous. Find out the majority of bad and diseased men over abandoned women, and multiply that number by their wives and children, and you will come to a mathematical conclusion as to how much more dangerous it is in one class than in the other. Some escape the worst consequence, but it must be admitted that *all* licentiousness produces physical deterioration. According to the opinions of eminent medical men, the specific disease we deplore has been generated by promiscuous intercourse, and it is not unnatural that the repetition of a provocative cause should have given birth to new and hideous forms. It cannot be denied that improper intercourse is the chief means of spreading it, and that almost, if not all existing cases, can be traced to that source, though some through several mediums. Leprosy, and many of the foul plagues that ravaged the world, are said to have been caused by the same means. I affirm that disease cannot be stamped out by the Acts, for some may infect hundreds without being aware of their state. In the next place, the *healthy* provisions of the Acts have been tried under the strictest supervision in Paris and have failed. If they were truly salutary this would be a practical impossibility. An English doctor must give a different recipe to a man because he is a Parisian or comes from Hong Kong. Some women are reformed—which might be done with other more extensive Acts—but those who remain are the more abandoned; the more opportunities they have for guilt, the greater the *danger* of their own destruction and that of others. It is rather a farce to preach repentance to them and at the same time to hold out every practical inducement to them to continue their mode of life. "A Surgeon" seems to forget that our Lord's words, "her sins that are many are forgiven," were addressed to a woman who was a true penitent, *not* to a woman who continued to lead an iniquitous life. Those who advocate the Acts on moral grounds should remember that many women of a *certain* class are made worse instead of better; they take the *worst* advantage of the Acts, which offer them increased facilities for wrong-doing. To prolong a life of infamy is a questionable benefit; to sacrifice the moral interests of the nation for such a questionable benefit is

mistaken "charity"—a word of warning to those who may waver on account of the truly appalling accounts of disease, which as an argument is worthless, for it is wrongly assumed that the repealers would, instead of the Acts, have passivity. They deplore the ghastly ravages of disease, if possible, more than the supporters of the Acts; they advocate more just, extensive, and deterrent measures. These measures have not been tried, and those who argue against them argue against unknown quantities. *They* would promote health by a means that unfortunately promotes vice; this is impossible, for where vice exists disease also exists; to promote one is to promote the other. From the moral provisions of the Acts beneficent results flow; but why not extend those moral provisions and found the Acts on a moral *basis?* I think you begin at the wrong end in acting as if vice was a necessity; surely that is the way to make it so? If men of like passions with their fellows are exempt, then why not others? It would take ages to stamp out vice; but I maintain that *preventive* laws, with every facility afforded for medical treatment would do more to stamp it out than any laws that protect it. Teaching and discipline do more than is imagined; the law is a great *educator*, the most powerful means of quickening the conscience of a people. "A natural impulse" is an excuse we are weary of hearing; the answer is, it can be restrained by law and education. It is natural for the hungry to steal, yet the hungry are often more honest than the rich. The law has not abolished crime, but it *deters* and *lessens* it; why not do the same in regard to this vital matter? "Why is it that the State, that alone can remedy a state of things so deplorable, is alone to refuse recognition?" It *does* recognise it in an invidious sense when it permits vice to be rampant everywhere, and enacts protective laws for it. Why not let the moral and civil law work *together?* The treatment of seduction suggested by "Clk.", and further amplified by a "Clergyman and Paterfamilias," would, I think, have a most salutary effect. Public solicitation should be illegal, and also the spreading of a dire contagion—as illegal as wilful murder. Something should be done to redress the wrongs of married women, to which they themselves are so blind, and to which the law is serenely indifferent; according to daily experience "killing is no murder" where wives and children are concerned. Every encouragement and provision should be made for healthy amusement for the people, especially in the way of out-door games and manly exercises. Some of the laws advocated are said to be impracticable; but who are responsible? Those who *will not* demand them; and is it not the duty of every right-thinking person to demand what is just and right? I cannot identify you with other exponents of the Acts, for you have in justice admitted the necessity of reform. There is one common object, to advance the health of the nation, the difference is as to *means*. Some would strike at the radical cause of the evil, others would leave it untouched, and by so doing defeat their own end; for the immediate good would be more than counteracted by the far wider results issuing from immorality, which has been the curse of all ages, and the *chief source of the deterioration and decay of races and nations*. It is not always exhibited in palpable forms, but the vastest changes come by little and little, so gradual as to be imperceptible. Virtue is a *greater* necessity than vice, and until that fact is recognised we cannot hope to make our nation healthy or noble. Some of your correspondents are accused of being "illogical," but the accusers are unable to refute the three fatal objections to their system, that it is unjust, immoral, and inefficient.

AN IRISHWOMAN.

SIR,—I have read the now almost voluminous correspondence, together with your own sensible remarks, on the subject of the Contagious Diseases Acts, in your admirable periodical, with the greatest possible interest, and I must add, with the deepest possible pain. Surely we are confronted by a gigantic evil, which, if the opinion of one of your correspondents be correct, is fast growing—one that will sorely tax our skill and efforts to counteract. I am, Sir, positively alarmed to think that such frightful immorality exists in Christian England! It is indeed a sad blot upon our country, and I may add upon our religion, and makes one almost wish that a special Sunday might be appointed, both in the churches of the Establishment and in those of our Nonconformist brethren, for rousing the people of England to a proper sense of the nefarious practices which are being secretly indulged, amongst all classes of the community, high and low, rich and poor, to the degradation of manhood and womanhood, and to the deterioration of our race, to say nothing of the enormous outrage that is committed against the majesty of God's moral law! I tremble to think of the consequences which such iniquities are entailing upon our posterity. Drunkenness, it was generally supposed, was *the* evil of the present day—I am rather inclined to think differently now—and to name immorality to be the evil of the day. You have, Sir, done a noble work in opening your columns to the discussion of this burning subject, and what I consider to be a very good sign of this correspondence is, that ladies are not backward in adding their quota to the experience of the male sex, and giving us the benefit of their advice in the matter.

Being a Guardian of the Ware Union, I can testify to the prevalence of immorality amongst the working classes. It is now a common thing for young girls of fifteen up to seventeen years of age to apply to our Board for admission into the Union wards, stating as a reason for the application that they are in the *family way*. I know a case in my parish of a young girl, that I thought to be as pure-minded as any girl I ever knew, now being near her confinement, and the father of the coming child being a young married man! I know another case, occurring within the area of the Ware Union, of a father and mother and a grown-up son and daughter, *all sleeping in one room*, and the daughter is now near *her* confinement—and it is rumoured from connection with her own brother! What, Sir, are we, the clergy, to do in such cases? Is it a subject that one can safely handle and discuss in the pulpit? I hope, Sir, that you will not close your columns to further communications on this subject. Let all be invited to give their experience—if they are capable of doing so. Could not a Church of England Society be formed for the purpose of striking at the root of this evil? The suppression of immorality is, in my opinion, quite as necessary as the suppression of drunkenness. Indeed, Sir, I would suggest very humbly that such a society should be formed and at once. Let the head-quarters be London, with branches in all our large seaport and inland towns—ah, and even in our villages if needs be. Let suitable tracts and pamphlets be written on the gravity of the offence, and let these be circulated over the land by thousands and millions. Will some one move in the work? I will help towards the formation of the society, and do all I can to set it

going. I am confident subscriptions will pour in from all parts of England.

I shall look very anxiously for replies to this letter of mine, and shall be delighted to reply privately to any communication addressed to me at my own residence.

R. PARROTT (Vicar of Amwell).

Amwell, Ware, Oct. 12, 1881.

SIR,—Your able leader of last Saturday completely disposes of the fallacy, so often put forward by the opponents of these Acts, that this disease is the natural penalty of fornication, and gives a very true description of syphilis, the more formidable of the diseases which these Acts are intended to prevent. The following extract from the speech of the late Mr. Ward Hunt at the debate in the House of Commons on the 19th July, 1876, will show its dire effects on innocent children :—"When we think of the innocent persons who have been alluded to, who suffer from this disease, I think it becomes the duty of the State to step in. With reference to this, I may call attention to statistics that I do not think have been mentioned in this House. What do I find in the Registrar-General's supplement to his 35th Annual Report of Births, Deaths, and Marriages? He says the registered deaths from syphilis during the 26 years from 1848 to 1873 were 31,860, of whom 22,269 were infants under one year of age; and 24,253 were under five years of age; so that of the registered deaths from this disease a very large proportion indeed were innocent babes. With these figures before us, I think no one can say that it is not the duty of the State, so far as in it lies, to repress this disease, and to prevent posterity being affected by so horrible a disorder."

Now it is incumbent on those who oppose these Acts on moral grounds to prove that those places where they are in force are more immoral than those where they are conspicuous by their absence, which they have not attempted to do. On the contrary, the evidence adduced before all the Select Committees and the Royal Commission, from magistrates, clergy, ministers, and others, whose opinions are perfectly disinterested, all goes to show that prostitution has considerably diminished, that women and girls (the latter especially) are deterred from entering on such a life, that more prostitutes have been reclaimed by the working of these Acts than was ever done before by philanthropic means, that street solicitation is almost unknown, and that hence much less immorality exists amongst men. Hence "E. T.'s" assertion that the present Act is a Protection of Prostitution Act, shows his ignorance as well as his want of logic. You cannot cure a prostitute without making her, in the elegant language of opponents, clean for safe indulgence. Hence you had better leave her alone. Such logic would have left many women on the streets who are now leading a respectable and virtuous life. And the best answer to the do-nothing suggestion of "E. T." is, that it has been tried for many, many years, and failed so hopelessly that it became necessary to pass these Acts. As Dr. Lyon Playfair said in 1870, "The very existence of these Acts places us beyond the stage of proving their original necessity." And as Parent Duchatelet, the eminent French author, wrote long before—"If legislation cannot render men virtuous; if it cannot correct the judgment and repress the impetuosity of passions which appeal to their senses too loudly to leave them the consciousness of duty; at least it may meet the danger to which the imprudent expose themselves, and for the sake of these men's wives and children, look after the health of the guilty, in order to preserve the innocent. I will go further, for I maintain that it ought to do so, and that those who have neglected this important duty have been unfaithful to their trust, and can only be excused by their ignorance of the benefits of the sanitary surveillance of prostitution."

18th October, 1881. A SURGEON.

SIR,—I feel it right to support the appropriate remarks of your correspondent, "An Irish Curate," on this all-important subject. "The System of Silence" (as he calls it) which a false conventionality imposes, is, indeed, one of the greatest helps to the flourishing of the deadly upas tree of sexual disease. I can, of my own knowledge, endorse his observation, that young men frequently are caught in this terrible snare through sheer ignorance of the danger that exists; and what *man*, at all events, is ignorant of the way in which temptation besets on all sides those whose passions at such an age are almost uncontrollably powerful.

There must be something very false in a state of society that hushes even the very allusion to passions which the Almighty has implanted in men and women for the highest and noblest ends. It must be wrong that such feelings seem often to be regarded as though they were *of themselves sinful*. Is it forgotten that they were implanted in man before sin entered into the world? Let it be remembered, moreover, that the highest and noblest feelings that animate the human heart have their intimate relationship to these which are often alluded to contemptuously as "mere animal passions." Deprived of these latter, the former would vanish too. No eunuch was ever known to be possessed of any noble qualities. The same thing may be observed in dogs so treated—they become deficient both in intelligence and affection.

I trust the discussion opened in your valuable pages may at least *tend* to dispel that "mock modesty" from a hollow society which *pretends* to be ignorant of what it well knows—at least all but the little of it that is *really innocent*. And valuable, indeed, would be the result, if such discussion should elicit any suggestions that would at all help to correct the present evils connected with prostitution and its train of human misery.

The wretched results of early and improvident marriages are sufficiently abundant to deter young people from that course. And as for polygamy, although not contrary to the laws of God, I fear it would introduce more evils than it would remove. By-the-way, let me remark that your other correspondent, "Another Clergyman," entirely mistakes the meaning of the passage of Scripture to which he alludes (Gen. xxxviii. 9,10), a mistake which, I believe, is often made. The sin of Onan was simply one of *fraud*, arising from the old sin of covetousness—"The love of money" it was. He wanted to get his brother's inheritance for himself, and therefore took means to obtain it by fraud, while *apparently* conforming to the law of Moses, as laid down in Deut. xxv. 5—10, and to escape the punishment therein imposed in case of refusal. *This* was "the thing which he did that displeased the Lord, wherefore he slew him."

AMICUS.

[Our Correspondent forgets that Onan lived long before Moses.—ED.]

The Church of England Pulpit.

JEREMIAH'S WARNINGS.

By the Rev. CANON RAWSTORNE, M.A.,
Vicar of Penwortham, Preston.

Sermon Preached at Penwortham on Sunday, October 9th, 1881.

"Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man."—Jer. v. 1.

"ALL things," says Paul, "that were written aforetime were written for our learning." We often, in our interpretation of this well-known passage, confine the words "all things" merely to the histories written in the books of the Hebrew Scriptures. Perhaps we might extend them to all histories of all time. All past events are full of instruction to those who have the qualities of mind and heart which find it; or, let us rather say, to those to whom God's Spirit has given the eyes to see and the ears to hear. For all events of the world's history are equally ordered by the Providence of God.

But Scripture histories are much the most instructive, because it is their special gift to look on every event and every character in relation to Almighty God, and, therefore, on its moral and spiritual side. The chapter read this morning contained the denunciation by a prophet and preacher, who was somewhat stern and harsh, somewhat desponding and pessimist, on the evils of his time. In the course of his inspired declamation he relates many historical facts, which were written for our learning, and whose lessons we may apply to our own times. We shall find some striking resemblances between the two periods, and these we shall be perhaps a little inclined to exaggerate. We must avoid that danger, and try to handle our subject as observant, calmly-thinking men. Then, perhaps, we shall find something appropriate to a harvest sermon—one of those occasions which seem to invite us to survey the field of the world, and to note the harvests of good and evil that are growing and ripening there.

1. The first point in the chapter is the search for a man. "Run ye to and fro in the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof among all the crowds that frequent them, if ye can find a *man*." Strange that that idea should occur to persons most widely distant in country and religion. Most know the old Greek story of Diogenes the cynic. He was seen one day in broad daylight, with a lighted lantern in his hand, looking about amongst the most crowded places of the city at Athens, as if seeking something. And when the men of the market-place came round him and asked, "What are you looking for, Diogenes?" the answer was, "I am seeking a man." To the foolish triflers with which the market-place was filled, eager, as in Paul's days, to hear some new thing, he would not give the honourable name.

Much in the same way Jeremiah said, 'Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem and see if ye can find a man." The character that he desired to find was a man that executed judgment and sought the truth—a true, just man. Ezekiel places the same wish in the lips of Jehovah, who inspired him: "I sought for a man among them, that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it: but I found none." The man whom Ezekiel desired to find was one of ruling mind, who could be a guide to his nation out of great difficulties and its deliverer out of great dangers.

That search for a man who can guide and rule; who can do righteousness, and speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; how does it come home to us, in these days of personal government, when conspicuous men are so idolized? We look at the fulsome flattery which is squandered on those distinguished persons whom we possess, which they accept but too gladly, and even heap upon themselves. And then we think—Is our English race exhausted and effete, that it can no longer produce men, strong and dutiful, such as adorned our fathers' generation? or men like those rugged, honest natures, of the same blood as we, which often rise to the front in young America, not through party, but outside of it, by the mere innate ascendency of what is strong and true? That is the first point that seems to me to come home in this chapter. It might be said with perfect truth—"Run ye to and fro through the streets of London, through the counties and towns of England, and see if ye can find a man." It is the want of our age, as of Israel long ago—a strong, firm, far-seeing, unchanging man, and, if possible, a silent one—

> One who can rule, and dare not lie.

2. He next complains how hard his people were to correct and reform. Calamities had no effect on them. "Thou hast stricken them, and they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction: they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return." Then he reflected that the majority of these were poor and ignorant. Education was in those days even less diffused than now: and to be poor was to be ignorant—a thing which now need no longer be. He said, "Surely, these are poor, they are ignorant: they know not the way of the Lord, and the judgment of their God."

Then he said he would turn to the higher class—"I will get me unto the great men, and will speak unto them." Ignorance cannot be the cause of failure there: they have had education; they should have light and virtue. "But these," he continues, "have altogether broken the yoke, and burst the bonds"—the bonds of morals and of religion, and of old ancestral habit, and of responsibility to those who look up to, and admire, and copy them. Such bonds, the prophet lamented, were altogether broken.

Does not this come home, too? The different classes exist now as then—higher and lower, and we may add the middle also, which has received such vast development in our time—differing in circumstances, and differing in their besetting sins—but all very sinful, no class having any great superiority to claim above the rest. The fault of the poorer, ignorance and that rashness of judgment which usually goes along with ignorance, but which sometimes clings still to impulsive natures, though possessed of enormous stores of learning. And the fault of the higher, that of feeling themselves *emancipated*, set free from all yokes and bands and restraints of every kind.

The defect here marked in the lower class is, in our time, fated to disappear. Their education up to a certain higher level of general knowledge is quite sure to take place, though the change may be delayed a little, here and there, by the carelessness of parents, and other such like causes. Whether the moral improvement will keep pace with the intellectual, is a much more doubtful question; or whether the net result, after all, will be greater happiness.

And what of the other symptom—the self-emancipation of the higher class from the restraints that once bound them—from the obligations, once so keenly felt, to set good examples, to maintain influential positions, to keep unspotted the reputation of ancient names, to be the chief prop and support of order, morals, and religion; to be first in all that is virtuous—according to the true old proverb, "*Noblesse oblige*"—if that process of emancipation, which has advanced so rapidly in our times, goes on increasing still, the effects will be ill indeed. Suppose that were to happen in England, which has just now happened in Ireland, that all the power and influence of the wealthier and higher class should be at once annihilated—much of their wealth still being left to them—the effect would probably be to remove all their feeling of responsibility. There would be nothing left for a possessor of wealth, but to use it for selfish and purposeless, and, very often, dissolute, enjoyment. It is only the tie of religion, and the feeling of responsibility which accompanies it, which can keep a higher class, or any class whatever, from "altogether breaking the yoke or bursting the bonds."

There follow here various prophetic denunciations, which we omit, of course, as unfitted for *our* lips. We may learn a prophet's historical and moral lessons, if we can; but we may not dream ourselves to be prophets too, and in that character repeat the solemn threatenings which God bade him speak, and lent him *His own* name to cover them. Such are not for us who are uninspired.

3. The next point is the advance, as it were, hand in hand, of idolatry and superstition with gross immorality. "Thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods." And then, "when I had fed them to the full, they committed adultery, and assembled themselves by troops in the harlots' houses." It is very difficult to say what is the connection between sensuous religion and sensual vice. But there certainly is a close connection between the two. The heroes and heroines of immorality have often been among the most fervent of devotees and the keenest of ecclesiastical partisans. Neither a taste for religious ornaments and ceremonies, nor an interest in the party questions of the Churches, are any guarantee of spirituality of mind, or have any good influence on morals.

Superstitions and idolatries are generally introduced by people who believe in them themselves, and are high-minded and pure in life. Such is the case with most of those who are restoring idolatries amongst us now: they are high-minded and sincere—without such qualities they would have little influence. But those who adopt their practices at second hand, embrace them as matters of taste and often of amusement; still oftener of mere party-spirit. And on these they have no constraining force whatever. To teach a man to restrain his desires, and to live a virtuous life, it needs the grace of the Spirit of God, and this can only come to serious, and genuine, and reasonable Faith. And such is a very different thing from an adherence, whether cold or enthusiastic, to the cries of the religious world, or a taste for the externals and decorations of religion.

4. The next thing reproved is the blind confidence of the people and their rulers in the stability and permanence of existing things. They said that no evil should come upon them, and that they should see neither sword nor famine. What actually did take place, about twenty years after Jeremiah wrote this chapter, was related in one of our lessons of last Sunday—"The wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy; therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword, in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age." The horrors which followed on occasions such as these may be learnt from the Nineveh sculptures, which, though of a slightly earlier age, depict exactly the manners and customs of Jeremiah's period. You may see there sculptured the im-

palings, and flayings alive, and other horrible punishments, inflicted by men who believed themselves to be ministers of avenging gods, and therefore knew no pity.

Perhaps Christianity, and the civilisation which has grown out of it has removed from our age of the world the possibility of horrors such as those. But could there not be found amongst us much of that over-confidence in the future, which the prophet reproves? We live in a very reckless age. Men act and speak without reflecting on the consequences of their deeds and words. It is so in the affairs of private life. And, worse than that, it is so in the highest places of government.* When those, whose position is the highest and responsibility the heaviest, condescend to evoke the applause of the unthinking, and mix themselves up with scenes of tumult, the stability of institutions is subjected to a breaking strain. Who can trust in the permanence of law or government, when those who should be pondering in the calm of council-chambers the means of upholding them, who should be weighing every word before it passes their lips, and limiting carefully the number of those words, lest a rash one should by chance escape, are crying in the public halls and streets, voluble, excited, one-sided, and bitter-hearted? May God cause all dark forebodings to be deceived, and all threatening dangers to melt away; and may the effect of such dangers as evidently exist, be, to make all minds very serious, and all speakers very cautious.

5. Another evil rebuked by the prophet is the spread of Atheism. He addresses the foolish people, and without understanding, who having eyes saw not, and having ears heard not: and then he continues describing the symptoms of their blindness. "Fear ye not Me? saith the Lord: will ye not tremble at My presence, which have placed the sand for the bounds of the sea by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it: and though the waves thereof toss themselves, yet can they not prevail, though they roar yet can they not pass over it. But this people hath a revolting and rebellious heart; they are revolted and gone. Neither say they in their heart, let us now fear the Lord our God, that giveth rain both the former and the latter in his season, that reneweth unto us the appointed weeks of the harvest." In these texts it is the God of Nature, and of Providence, the one who marks out sea and land, and gives the rain and sunlight of heaven, from Whom the people are accused of falling away. Now the world was scandalised a little while ago by a confession of Atheism, in a very conspicuous place, by a Member of Parliament, and a great stir that open confession made. But I cannot think that these open confessions of Atheism are very dangerous things. Such rather disgust and repel the better class of minds. The dangerous things are those views which cut the foundations out of the belief in God, without directly attacking it. I will give an example or two. I read a little while ago, in an article by one who supposed himself to be defending Christianity by finding a new basis for it, a denial of nature's testimony to God. He said that man could not, according to the famous line ascend through nature up to nature's God, but that nature only leads to the original atoms of which all things are composed. The tale which the heavens are always telling of the glory of God had been silenced altogether for this writer. And his Atheism, although unconscious, was much more profound than that of any who openly and coarsely deny their God. To say that heaven and earth do not speak to us of God is the same thing as saying that there is no God at all. I read again, in a writing of a man of a very different school, a statement that it is only by a ritual—by outwardce remonies of religion—that a feeling of reverence can be produced, or a belief in God maintained. If that be true, reverence and belief in God are what the revolutionists say they are, artificial things, generated by ceremony, invented by priests, which cannot rise spontaneously as they did to David, when he considered the heavens the work of the Creator's hands. In his desert pastures, surrounded by his sheep, that Psalmist watched the moon and the stars which God had ordained, and then the sun going forth as a bridegroom from his chamber, and rejoicing as a giant to run his race. There his heart was filled with reverential awe, and the exclamation burst from his lips, "O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth! Who hast set Thy glory above the heavens."

It is on a harvest thanksgiving day that we are most naturally led to express our belief in the great God of Nature and of Providence. Whatever we receive, through whatever natural channel, in obedience to whatever natural law, to His bounty we owe it all. He made the outward objects, through the operation of His laws, and these laws are the grandest of all His creatures.

6. Once more, the prophet rebukes prevailing dishonesty. "Among my people are found wicked men: they lay wait, as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men. As a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit; therefore they are become great and waxen rich." How many examples do our times also present of great wealth based on fraud; and with how little scruple are the guilty received in society, and the gratifications, which their wealth enables them to procure, shared. Their money is good, and it is needless curiosity (men think) to enquire how it may have been gained.

* The head of an executive government promotes to a high place of trust and honour a man who openly defies the law—a declaration in favour of anarchy by the person who, of all the nation, is under the heaviest obligations to maintain order and obedience.

7. Then last of all there comes the denunciation of those whose vocation it was to remedy these things. "The prophets shall become wind" (mere wind-bags as poor old Thomas Carlyle used to say in the days of his prophesying) "and the word is not in them." And then again, "a wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land. The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule through their means."

A wonderful and horrible thing was that indeed. The double ministry of priest and prophet, the performer of ceremonies of religion, and the speaker of the Word of God, are each traced by the Old Testament to a divine origin. Usually they were entirely independent of each other, and controlled and corrected one another. Now, they were allied, not for, but against the truth. A solemn lesson there is here for our days of Church-idolatry. Even divine institutions may fall from their high estate, may be taken possession of by God's enemy, and made to work against Him. It is a striking example of a solemn truth; but not the most striking. There came a day, when the scribes, who sat in Moses' seat, successors of the prophets, and the priests, the sons of Aaron, were allied once again. It was to crucify the Messiah of Israel, the Desire of all nations, the Saviour of the world. What happened to the successors of Moses and Aaron may surely happen also to the successors of the Apostles, if such there be. Jeremiah notes the fact that such perversions of religion were popular. "My people love to have it so." In our day, popularity is the test applied to all religion. Preaching, or ceremonies, or decorations which draw crowds to hear or see them, must surely be good. It did not seem so in those old times, when idolatry was as popular as it is fast becoming now. Then the test was Truth. This, and this alone, is the limit of toleration in matters of ritual or of doctrine.

And then the prophet asks, What will ye do in the end thereof? When all these tendencies of the age have developed their natural and necessary consequences, what sort of a state of things will have been introduced? Perhaps, in our case, a generation enjoying ceremonies, but utterly fallen from reasonable faith.

You will very likely apply Jeremiah's phrase of the prophets who are as wind, directly to us of the ministry, and we should have hard work to prove it to be entirely false. Of how many a word, which the routine of duty has compelled us to pronounce, have we felt conscious ourselves that there was as little substance in it as in the wind, and that it would have no more effect on the hearers than the passing breeze, because, while the word of man was there, the Word of God was not in it? I daresay you will all see this far more clearly even than we.

And now I have done nothing to-day except just draw the lessons of our morning's chapter one by one before our eyes. Its words are well worth studying, as all these chapters are. There is much in it, as was said of the pessimist, that is the man whose tendency is to look at matters on their worst side. Some good men are so—given to discouragement and despondency, and such was Jeremiah. But he sometimes had his correcting glimpses of a brighter future. It was in the midst of forebodings even darker than what we have read to-day, that there came to him the lovely vision of the Lord our Righteousness. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is the name whereby He shall be called—The Lord our Righteousness."

Let our closing words express just such a hope of a happier future. The time came at last to Jeremiah's people, when they found their man. And their man was the same in whom we also believe, the man Christ Jesus. All the errors of our times are breaches of His rules, or departures from the simplicity of his Gospel, or failures to copy the beauty of His character. Our business is to return to Him—to learn to believe and practise original Christianity as it came from Christ; His filial dependence and affection towards a Heavenly Father; His direct, inartificial, unstudied mode of address to that Father; His unaffected sincerity of heart and life; His utter contempt for ecclesiastical tradition; his neglect of the subtleties of theology; His worship in spirit and in truth; His practice of the highest and purest morals; His complete self-sacrifice and self-denial; His universal charity. Still He cries amongst us, as in other times, "Come unto Me, ye who are weary and heavy-laden." "Come unto Me," we may add in His name, "ye who are happy and prosperous too, and all learn of Me." Take Him for your exemplar. Not the Church of England of the last three centuries; not the teachers of the Reformation period; not those of the Middle Ages; not those of the declining Roman Empire. Learn of none of these as your authorities. But go to the Fountain-head, and learn the original Christianity that came from Christ; and find there rest for each anxious soul, and rest at last for the agitated period in which we live.

The Cambridge University sermon was preached on Sunday last by the Lord Bishop of Durham, to an overflowing congregation. The text was Gen. xxviii. 16—"Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not." At the conclusion of the sermon his lordship made a powerful appeal for help for the Barnwell and Chesterton Clergy Fund. In the evening the Bishop preached at Great St. Mary's, on behalf of the Cambridge Female Mission.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1881.

OUR correspondent "C. P. R.," whose historical knowledge and logic are generally so accurate and convincing, appears to be so moved by the recollection of his perusal of the Korân, that he is somewhat unjust to "Clk." who recommended compulsory marriage in cases of seduction, and to ourselves for testifying, from experience in the East, as to its efficacy as a preventive. "Clk.," the incumbent of a large parish, is no doubt thoroughly in earnest. May not the gigantic evils of our present system of polyandry far outweigh those of a well-regulated and punitive polygamy? The discussion of such a remedy may ruin our publication, but we would remind our prophet that the Old Testament and the Korân, which illustrate the *practice* as well as theory of polygamy have not yet been banished from English houses. Mahomet was not the inventor of polygamy, and it is strange that our correspondent, as a dignitary of the Church, should forget that all the holiest men, and most of the holiest women too, of the Old Testament were polygamists, and are nowhere denounced as such in the New Testament. St. Paul's injunction, "Let each man have his own wife, and each woman her own husband," does not seem to us to be clearly inconsistent with polygamy: it *is* an injunction to marry, and our correspondent admits that polygamy was practised in those days, if not in that Church; so that we cannot construe this text to absolutely forbidding polygamous marriages: neither can we logically infer that polyandry is permissible if polygamy is. It has pleased God to make a physical difference between male and female, and to forbid polyandry under the New as well as the Old Dispensation. St. Paul says of the *woman* only, not of the man, that if she intermarries with another she is guilty of adultery (Rom. vii. 1—3; 1 Cor. vii. 39). Our readers, we are sure, have heard enough of the ghastly results of the rampant polyandry in our midst to need further description; and if any form of polygamy would cure or alleviate the moral and physical evils which flow from this ungodly and unnatural system, it might be a blessing to the women more than to the men of our own country. We admit that the New Testament *recommends* monogamy, and that it is by far the better system if *early and universal marriage* were practised. The numerical equality of the sexes, as "C. P. R." truly says, proves this. We put a different construction on the words, "they twain shall be one flesh," to what our correspondent does, and we submit that St. Paul does also. (1 Cor. vi. 16.)

CHURCH CONGRESS.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR PLUMPTRE, VICAR OF BICKLEY, KENT.

It seems to me that I shall best deal with the subject on which I have been asked to write by not attempting anything like a detailed discussion of the changes made by the Revisers. I take this course partly because it is not easy to take a survey of 36,000 variations within the space of twenty minutes. Even if one were to select but 1,000th part of those changes, that would still give the somewhat narrow average of ·555 of a minute for each. Partly, also, I write in the hope that, so far as the subject admits of being treated at all in this way, it will be sufficiently handled by the eminent scholars who precede and follow me. If it were necessary to add a third reason, I should find it in the fact that the last four or five months have given us, in reviews, magazines, and newspapers, an abundant harvest of discussions from all points of the compass. The wise and the unwise have each had their say: the latter, as was natural, more quickly and more loudly than the former.

I aim, therefore, at pointing out some thoughts which seem worth considering in connexion with the several stages through which the great work, which has now been brought to its completion, has had to pass; and I take these in their natural order of its beginnings, its progress, its reception, and its future.

I. The history of the work in its inception teaches the old lesson of nil desperandum, and the ultimate, though it may be long delayed, victory of truth. Many of us are old enough to remember the time when the only prominent advocate of revision was found in Mr. Heywood, who thought it a fit subject to occupy the attention of the House of Commons. There it was treated, as might be expected, as one of the crazes or crotchets with which private members disport themselves on Wednesday afternoons, and was met with the usual arguments of a timid and prejudiced Conservatism. It would unsettle men's minds and shake the foundations of their faith. What could be desired better than the incomparable version which had associated itself with the life and literature of the English people? No bishops were found to sanction the proposal; and her Majesty's Ministers could give no sanction to a scheme which would wound the feelings of the great body of the clergy and their flocks. It was a significant fact that, when the *Speaker's Commentary* was first started and the contributors were invited to take counsel as to its plan, a modest proposal on the part of one of them, that a Revised Version should be printed in parallel columns with the

Authorised, was stamped out by the most Rev. Prelate, who had a supreme influence in that enterprise. Even Archbishop Trench, though he felt the necessity of such a work in the future, and supplied valuable materials for it, took up the position which we have learnt to describe by a French term as that of an Opportunist, and held that the opportunity had not come. "The Greek and the English necessary to bring it to a successful issue were alike, in his judgment, wanting." The same line had been taken by Professor Scholefield, and there was a more determined resistance to the proposal on the part of men like Dr. Scrivener, whom we have since been glad to welcome as a Reviser, Dr. M'Caul, the Rev. S. C. Malan, and Dr. Cumming. It might have seemed as if, in Tyndale's words, "there was no room, either in my Lord of London's Palace or in all England," for a Revised Version, or, in Cranmer's vigorous phrase, that if men waited for it at the hands of the Bishops they "would have to wait to the day after doomsday."

There were not wanting, however, a few bolder and more hopeful champions. Foremost among these we may rank the honoured name of William Selwyn. The five clergymen (Alford, Moberley, Barrow, Humphry, Ellicott), who published two or three of the Epistles as examples of the way in which the work might be done, did something to prepare the way. To the last-named of these, however, belongs pre-eminently the credit of having led the vanguard in what at first seemed as a forlorn hope, of having uttered the boldest and truest words on this matter that had yet been spoken. He asked, in the preface to his Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, whether it was right to resist all proposals for a revision, and he returned the answer, "God forbid. . . . . It is in vain to cheat our souls with the thought that the errors in the Authorised Version are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there *are* misconceptions, there *are* obscurities. . . . And that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of those allegations, nevertheless permits himself to deny or denounce them, will . . . have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable words of God." So he wrote in 1862, when there seemed little hope of being listened to, and now, like most men who have the courage of their convictions, he has seen his great task brought to its close. If he has to hear hisses as well as cheers from those who have not borne the burden and heat of the day as he has done, it is only, as we shall see, what others in the cause have had to hear before him.

To the writer of the article on the Authorised Version in Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," from whom I have borrowed somewhat largely in this narrative, may also be ascribed something of the character of a prophetic soul musing on things to come. After dwelling on the various points which chiefly required attention—the basis of a revised Greek text, due respect for the style and phraseology of the Authorised Version, the general rule of rendering the same Greek or Hebrew words by the same English, as contrasted with the fantastic principle avowed by the Revisers of 1611 of ringing the changes as widely as possible on the grounds of an imaginary fairness, as though words were candidates for the suffrage, a more careful discrimination of the force of tenses, cases, articles, and prepositions—on the lines which are traced with a firm hand in the preface to the Revised New Testament, he ended, writing in 1863, with words which I will quote—"The work, it is believed, ought not to be delayed much longer. Names will occur to every one of men competent to undertake the work as far as the New Testament is concerned; and, if such alterations only were to be introduced as commanded the consent of at least two-thirds of a chosen body of twenty or thirty scholars, while a place in the margin was given to such renderings only as were adopted by at least one-third, there would be, it is believed, at once a great change for the better, without any shock to the feelings or even the prejudices, of the great mass of readers. . . . As the Revised Bible would be for the use of the English people, the men appointed for the purpose ought not to be taken exclusively from the English Church, and the learning of Nonconformists ought, at least, to be fairly represented. The changes recommended by such a body of men, under conditions such as those suggested, might safely be allowed to circulate experimentally for two or three years. When they had stood that trial, they might without risk be printed in the new Authorised Version. Such a work would unite reverence for the past with duty towards the future. In undertaking it we should not be slighting the translators on whose labours we have entered, but following in their footsteps. It is the wisdom of the Church to bring out of its treasures things new and old."

Here, also, the anticipations of the writer, then hoping against hope, have been unexpectedly and abundantly fulfilled. Even the Opportunists were obliged to confess that the opportunity had at last come. Even Convocation—

> Via prima salutis,
> Quod minime reris, Graiâ pandetur ab urbe,—

opened its arms, with an unlooked for expansion of heart and intellect, to the admission of Nonconformists as fellow-workers with deans and bishops. Only the irreconcileables of Church politics on the right hand and the left were found to take up their parable and utter Cassandra warnings, "prognosticating a whole year of sects and schisms." At one time, indeed, there seemed to be the risk of a reaction. Some even of those who had been foremost in urging this comprehensiveness recoiled at what was its logical and legitimate conclusion. They could accept the presence of men of other religious communities in the work of making the English Bible, more than it had been before, a true presentation of the mind of the Eternal Spirit. It seemed to them startling and sacrilegious that those engaged in that work should begin their labours by a solemn act of adoration, intercession, communion, prayer, for that Spirit's guidance.

II. The enterprise, however, was not wrecked even upon that rock. The floods might lift up their voice, and the waves rage horribly, but the ship was steered by an expert pilot, and it made its way calmly, if slowly, through those stormy waters. Of the difficulties within the Council Chamber I have no power and no right to speak. The divisions, the casting vote, the resolutions modified or rescinded, are not as yet in the category even of open secrets, except so far as they have been disclosed by the dissentients who have thought it seemly to "wash their hands" in public. But there is one point in connexion with those labours which seems to me to have been some-

what strangely passed over. So far at least, as my knowledge goes, it has hardly been touched upon in any spoken or written utterance. The ten years' task on which the Revisers entered was one to which they were drawn only by a strong sense of duty. It was, from first to last, as that of the Revisers of 1611 had been, unpaid labour. They gave on an average forty days a year of hard work, to say nothing of what each of them may have done at home, or by way of correspondence, without the prospect of any remuneration, or, I may add, in most cases, of any increase of personal reputation. To some, indeed, previously but little known beyond the world of scholars, it may have been felt as an honour to be invited to co-operate in such a work; but of the greater part it is obvious that their position was before so high that such a summons could not raise it, and was simply an appeal to their acknowledged fame on the principle that *Noblesse oblige*. And in such a work it must be remembered there is absolutely no opening for individual distinction. The labours of each are merged in the collective result of those of all. No one knows who suggested this special point of accuracy or that felicitous rendering. There is no published, if any, record who formed the majority that determined the text of the Revised Version, or the minority whose opinion was relegated to the margin. Each was content to do his work faithfully, "not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God," and in that fear of God, and the consciousness of ministering to His truth, to find his own, and his only, exceeding great reward. That plea, which I have thought it right to make on behalf of the Revisers, because they will never make it for themselves, ought, I think, to check the tongues of many who, "intellectually unable to test" the value of their work, are therefore forward in harshly condemning it.

III. I pass to that which this last sentence in part foreshadows, the reception which that work has met with. It was not to be expected that a Revised Version of a sacred book should meet at first with an unqualified acceptance. There is a natural, and within due limits, a righteous reverence for that with which men have been familiar from their childhood, for the very rhythm, the cadence of which is associated with the most sacred memories of their lives. It has been so in the past, and we may be thankful that it is so still. So, when the Jews returned from their Babylonian exile, and heard, according to the received tradition of the Rabbis, the first Targum, or paraphrase of the law, in another tongue than the old sacred Hebrew, they wept then, as they had wept before, when they remembered the greater glory of the first Temple as they laid the foundation of the second. It was so when the Alexandrian Jews made their Septuagint translation, and those of Palestine looked on it as a national humiliation, almost a national sin, and commemorated it, as they did the crime of the golden calf, by a solemn annual fast. (Walton, *Proleg.* ix.) It was so when Jerome put forth his Vulgate to take the place of the older Latin version, and was rebuked even by Augustine for thinking that he could discover anything that had escaped the notice of so many skilled interpreters, and for daring to set aside the pre-eminent authority of the Septuagint. What Augustine dwelt on most was that when an African Bishop had read the Book of Job in the Revised Version there was an actual uproar among the people, because what they heard differed from that to which they had been accustomed all their lives, and which had been read for centuries. (August. *Epp.* xlviii., lxvi.) It was so when Erasmus published his Latin translation of the New Testament, and Standish, afterwards Archbishop of York, preaching at Paul's Cross, prognosticated the total extinction of Christianity unless these new-fangled versions were suppressed. Was it not intolerable that he, a doctor of so many years' standing, should be sent to school by a "shallow and pretentious Grecian," like Erasmus? Was it not enough to call for the tears which the preacher poured forth "to the astonishment of the men, and the edification of the women." (Brewer, *English Studies*, p. 371.) It was so when Tyndale entered on his great work, confessedly the basis of all that has been done well and wisely since in the translation of the New Testament, and was denounced by bishops and by scholars—even by Sir Thomas More—as a pestilent fellow, a "foul and blasphemous heretic, ignorant of Greek, corrupting the Sacred Text in at least a thousand places." (More's *Dialogue*, iii. 8.) It was so, lastly, when the so-called Authorised Version of 1611 was published, and Hugh Broughton, most eminent among the Hebrew scholars of the day, declared that he "would rather be torn in pieces by wild horses than impose such a translation upon the poor people of England." (*Broughton's Works*, p. 661), or Selden, damning with faint praise and civil leer, condemned it for its literal accuracy as "being well enough so long as scholars have to do with it, but when it comes among the common people, 'Lord! what gear do they make of it.'" (*Table Talk.*)

With this induction before us, we shall not be surprised at any amount of repugnance or obloquy which the Revised Version may encounter, even from scholars of repute. This, at least, may be said, prior to that examination of the work on which I do not enter, that there is a strong antecedent presumption in favour of the Revisers as against the vast majority of their critics Never before were so many scholars of repute, furnished with all the latest results of criticism and philological culture, brought together for such a work. Never was there such a security against the subtle influence of sectarian bias as that which was found in the composition of the revising body. Never did any such body of men labour so long or so assiduously at their task, or take so many precautions against hasty and inconsiderate decisions. On any theory of probabilities the odds in their favour are as 1,000 to 1. In this diocese, I may, perhaps, venture to add that those odds rise to a yet higher figure when we remember that their work was largely anticipated, both in its main lines, and in several hundred instances, in the volume "On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament," published by him who was then Professor Lightfoot. As a matter of fact, the accuracy of their version is, I imagine, generally acknowledged. What we hear, for the most part, are complaints that take the form of "No: I don't like that" coming from those who cannot or will not, ask the question whether what they like is the truer rendering of the original. Men will not give up their old *mumpsimus* for the new-fangled *sumpsimus*. We hear sneers from those who should know better, at the minute care bestowed upon articles and particles. Others content themselves with "foolish talking and jesting which are not convenient," about the substitution of "love" for "charity;" while others, again, feel – or affect to feel—a serious alarm lest it should lead to the spread of an unrestrained licentiousness. Some object to the

introduction of the "Evil One" into the Lord's Prayer, because it gives a fresh prominence to a dogma which they regard as obsolescent; others, forgetful apparently of the explanation of the Lord's Prayer given in the Church Catechism, forgetful also of the fact that in our Lord's personal experience, temptation had been identified with the presence of the Tempter, maintain that the prayer to be delivered from our "ghostly enemy" is not a Christian prayer, and therefore cannot have been that which He gave to His disciples. Some object to the respect shown to the older MSS., and maintain, apparently, as the result of a new theory of probabilities, that the accuracy of the copies of any book varies *inversely* as their nearness to the original. Perhaps, however, the most prominent objection heard in many quarters, and endorsed by no less an authority in literature than Mr. Spurgeon, is that the style of the Revised New Testament is bad. The Revisers, we are told, may have been good Greek scholars, but their scholarship did not extend to English. The rhythm, the music, of the Old Version is gone, the brightness of the fine gold is departed, and we have instead the stammering lips of pedagogues, and the harsh clang of a tinkling cymbal. I confess that I have learnt to be somewhat distrustful of such objections. A man, for the most part, does know whether he has learnt Greek or not. He is liable to a very subtle form of self-deceit as to the question whether he has learnt English. I venture to think that the names of Ellicott, Lightfoot, Stanley, Trench, Vaughan, Angus, Moulton, carry with them a greater weight of authority in this matter than even those of Mr. Washington Moon and Mr. Spurgeon. I ask, and this Congress gives a wide field for the challenge, whether any turn of language or structure of sentence is to be found in the Revised Version which may not be paralleled from writers of the best age of our literature, or was not forced upon the Revisers by the absolute necessities of faithfulness as translators? If we have before us the alternative of euphony or truth, which ought we to choose? My own conviction is that in proportion as we give the Revised Version a fair trial, even that alternative will not be forced upon us, and that we shall soon find that our ears will become familiar with the new rhythm as they have been with the old, and would then resent a change as much as, it is assumed, they resent it now.

Thus much, at least, may be said for the work of the Revisers, that now, for the first time, the student of the English New Testament is placed almost, or altogether, on a level with the student of the Greek, is made acquainted with all the more important variations of the text, and with the authority which is due to each, is less likely to be misled in the use of an English concordance by the use of many English words for one Greek, or one English word for many Greek, is able to see when the inspired writers spoke of an action as completed at a given moment, or continuing in its results, or only inceptive and incomplete, has the prepositions and conjunctions which they thought fit to use brought before him with the meaning which they attached to them. And this, it will I think be admitted, is no small gain. I can imagine no better training for the theological student; no better test of the merits of the two translations, than that he should sit down with his Greek Testament before him, and the Authorised and Revised Versions on either side, noting where they differ, and inquiring, with lexicon, grammar, and concordance to help him, as to the grounds on which the differences rest.

If I were to assume the attitude of a critic, I should, I think, be disposed to express a regret that the Revisers have not had the courage to go some steps further than they have done. The "Holy Spirit" might well have taken the place of the "Holy Ghost" throughout; "Gehenna," like "Hades," might have avoided, where it is used in the Greek, the ambiguity of the English "Hell." The distinction between "demon" and "devil" need not have been obliterated. I do not see why we should not, in translating the Greek Testament, follow the rule, now all but uniformly adopted in translating other Greek books, and give the names of Heathen deities as they stand in the text, Zeus, Hermes, Artemis, instead of their Latin equivalents. From more detailed criticism of passages in which my own judgment would have led me to vote for the reading of the margin rather than for that of the text, or to have suggested some third rendering, I purposely refrain.

IV. I turn, lastly, to the future of the Revised Version. How far is it desirable that it should be read in churches? If desirable, how is that result to be brought about? We have been told, on the high authority of the present Lord Chancellor, in his letter in the *Times* of June 3rd, 1881, that "any clergyman using the Revised Version in reading the Lessons before it has been recommended or authorised by some sufficient authority will incur a serious risk of being held to be an offender against law." It is unfortunate, though it was, perhaps, unavoidable, that the opinion thus given is left incomplete in one essential point. Lord Selborne does not tell us what, in his judgment, would be a "sufficient authority." Would it be within the discretion of an individual bishop to sanction the public use of the Revised Version in his diocese? Could the Convocations of Canterbury and York give that sanction, each for its respective province? Could a new Order of Council place that version on the same level as the imaginary order which Lord Selborne "reads into" the title page of our printed Bibles, as "appointed to be read in Churches?" Or would it be necessary, as seems logically to follow from Lord Selborne's line of reasoning, that an Act of Parliament should repeal the Act of Uniformity, so far as it gave a statutory force to that imaginary order? On these questions the oracle is dumb, and I too shrink from speaking. So far as I venture to suggest a doubt as to the conclusion which Lord Selborne does not leave doubtful, it would be on the grounds—(1.) That documents which have only an ideal or potential existence, though the probability that they may have existed may rightly guide a doubting conscience, are not commonly made the basis of action which involves pains and penalties. (2.) That the fact that Andrewes, Hall, and other divines continued, after 1611, to quote freely from the Bishops' or Geneva Bible, even when they preached before the King, hardly looks as if the version of 1611 had come exclusively into use. (3.) That when the Puritans speak of that version at the Savoy Conference, they describe it as "*allowed* by authority," and that that term, though it may mean "approved," is not one which would have been naturally applied to a version the use of which had been made compulsory. It was, in fact, the very phrase which had been used of the Homilies and of Sternhold and Hopkins's Psalms, the use of which was confessedly optional. (4.) That there is, so far as I am aware, no record of any complaints on the part of churchwardens that they were compelled to buy a new Bible in 1611 after

they had been ordered to buy a costly folio of the Bishops' Version by the canons of 1604. (5.) That the visitation articles of many bishops between 1611 and 1640, inquiring whether the King's Version was read in Churches, seem to apply a gradual and tentative rather than a rapid and compulsory process. It follows, as it seems to me, from these facts, that it is, to say the least, probable that the lost Order in Council, if there ever were such an Order, was permissive rather than compulsory. (See, on the subject of this paragraph, an article on "The Authorisation of the English Bible" in *Macmillan's Magazine* for October, 1881, by the Rev. Randall T. Davidson.)

I agree, however, with Lord Selborne and the Bishop of Lincoln, that it is not desirable that this use of the Revised Version should be left to the discretion of individual clergymen. If, as matters now stand, they have a right to use that Version, they have a right to use any other, though the claims of that other might be infinitely less than those of the Revised Version, and this licence might evidently lead to great confusion. What I would venture to urge upon our rulers in Church and State is that matters should not be allowed to drift towards that confusion. We cannot expect that intelligent and conscientious men will be content to go on for ever using a worse Version when a better one is accessible, "dealing deceitfully," in Bishop Ellicott's language, "with the Word of God." And the course which it would be wise and right to take is happily not far to seek. In the first instance, either by the collective action of the Archbishops and Bishops, or by that of the two Convocations, a case might be submitted to counsel asking what would be the "sufficient authority" of which we are in search. When that opinion was given it might be made the basis of action, and, according to its tenor, application might be made to Bishops, or the two Convocations, or the Queen in Council, or to Parliament, for the sanction which is required. Whether it would be wise to take that action now, or to wait until we have the Revised Version of the Old Testament as well as the New, is a detail which may well be left to the authorities of whom I have been speaking. As to the form which the sanction should take, the course adopted in regard to the Revised Lectionary seems to present a natural precedent. For some seven years or so it might be left optional to use the so-called Authorised Version of 1611 or the Revised Version of 1881. By the end of that time it would be seen which had the most hold on the mind of the English clergy and the English people. I have little doubt as to the result; and believe, without committing myself to any doctrine of finality, that the words "Appointed to be read in Churches" might then appear on the title-page of our Revised Bible, with a less doubtful origin and a better defined authority than they do at present. The old history would be acted over again. When the Revisers of 1611 had finished their work, they sent it forth with a prelude which might well be echoed by their successors:—"Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising anything ourselves, or revising that which hath been laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion instead of love, and with emulation instead of thanks: and if there be any hole left for cavil to enter (and cavil, if it do not find a hole, will make one), it is sure to be misconstrued and in danger to be condemned." So they felt then; but the issue of their labours was that, after the critics and the cavillers had had their little day, they earned the gratitude, for two centuries, of English-speaking Christendom. Those who have now followed in their footsteps and carried their great work somewhat nearer to perfection may look forward with a good hope to a like reward.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Is there no one who will raise a voice against the misuse of Scripture in this correspondence? Can no one see that moral ideas, as all other ideas, are progressive, and that the highest moral ideas of the nineteenth century were as impossible to the writers of the Old Testament as were the scientific ideas of the nineteenth century. God taught His people of old, and led them gradually to a higher and higher morality; but has God ceased to teach the nations? Is He not teaching His people still? What is the cause of all this stir which is now being made in the matter? Is it that the world is worse than it ever was before? No; it is because there are minds in the world that are better than they ever were before, and who have opened their eyes to see the presence of evils which seem greater than they were only because they are brought into the light of a higher moral sense and are measured by the continually rising standard of a higher moral ideal. Let there be then full discussion as to the best means of promoting that higher morality, even if it be by such as those advocated by "Clk."; but let no one endeavour to confuse our ideas by bringing forward Scripture to prove that a state of Polygamy is consistent with as high a moral standard as is Monogamy, or that the difference between them is only conventional. If society were ever again to recognise it as such (a thing impossible) it would be a retrograde movement; it would be a stemming of that glorious tide which through the ages is sweeping onwards towards the bringing in of an everlasting righteousness.

AN IRISH CORRESPONDENT.

SIR,—I think that you have written wisely and bravely on the subject of the Contagious Diseases Acts, but I question very much whether bigamy or polygamy, proposed as a remedy, is on the true lines of our social development. Turks themselves are not unmindful of the drawbacks of polygamy; *e.g.*, their proverb:

Duo asini, una Carewana
Duæ uxores, unum forum.

Cam Vicarage, Oct. 25, 1881. F. T. P.

SIR,—It certainly *was* incorrect to say that Onan transgressed the "Law of *Moses*," since, as you observe, "Onan lived long before" that Law-giver. But yet it is quite plain that the law with reference to this matter *existed prior* to his enactments, which only, in this case, *embodied what had previously obtained*—as is evident from the instance in question. When Judah's eldest son, Er, died, he directed his second son, Onan, to take the widow, Tamar, and raise up seed "*to thy brother*." And when Onan also died, she was reserved to wait till the third brother, Shelah, should be old enough to take her. So that it plainly appears that

the sin of Onan was nothing else than that of *fraud*, as before stated—since he could have had no other possible motive in withholding seed from his brother's widow than that of keeping the inheritance for himself—as we are told—knowing "that the seed should not be his." AMICUS.

SIR,—I must enter my emphatic protest against the doctrine that polygamy is permitted under the New Testament, because it is not in so many words forbidden. The whole spirit of the New Testament is against it: and the original expression in St. Paul's injunction, "let each man have his own wife, and each woman her own husband," clearly indicates that appropriation of each to each which is utterly inconsistent with polygamy, when "each woman has *not* her *own* husband," for he may be the husband of many other women.

If polygamy be permissible, then polyandry is; for the sexes are on a complete equality in this respect of non-appropriation: in other words, each woman may have a dozen husbands! That polygamy has not been carried out into this its logical consequence, in Mohammedan countries, is simply owing to the fact that the legislators have been men, not women. If anyone wants to see this disagreeable subject illustrated with a superabundance of true, but most licentious, wit, he may look into Montesquieu's "Lettres Persanes." The impossibility, under polygamy, of the man discharging his obligations to the woman (1 Cor. vii. 3), is the foundation of the catastrophe of that romance; and the victims of polygamy have every right, physically speaking, to break their one-sided and most iniquitous marriage vow.

I think it is hardly a healthy sign of the times that such theories should be advanced, even when only half in earnest, as I am persuaded is the case here. Their defence will necessarily involve the ruin of any publication which favours them; for the English people are not so emancipated from the fair traditions of their fathers as to receive with patience suggestions for Mohammedanizing Christendom, on the plea of promoting health.

As to the practice of the world in the Apostolic age, I believe entirely that the Jews were then gradually and not slowly rising out of the lowering and debasing Oriental system of marriage, and assimilating themselves to the higher level of Western life.

The very near equality of the sexes is a further argument, if one were wanted, against polygamy. Where society is not ruined by artificial methods, no man can have more than one wife without robbing another man of a wife. This is the plain ordinance of God, further developed for the Christian into an unmistakeable obligation by the words of Christ, "They *twain* shall be one flesh." These words are not *true* in the case of polygamy. It is rather fashionable now to "appreciate" Mohammed. I have read the Korân myself in the original, though not the whole of it; and I must say that a nearer acquaintance with it has stamped its more distinctive portion (the latter parts, chronologically taken), written when Mohammed had acquired power, as an almost incoherent tissue of vain repetitions and blasphemous pretensions: bearing the plain stamp of conscious fraud. And some of the worst of this portion is that in which the so-called Prophet ascribes to the Almighty a command to him to take the wife of one of his faithful followers—his ewe-lamb—from him, and add her to his own already numerous harem. C. P. R.

SIR,—The opponents of these Acts do not propose "to stand by and give a silent sanction to the cynic exhortations" of Timon the Athenian, nor "to stand upon the high bank of 'public morality,' and place the 'good ship Contagious Diseases Act'" in quarantine, lest it should land a plague-stricken wretch, forsaken of God and man, appealing for help to the sympathies and the charity of their pharisaical neighbours on shore. With such sentiments, however, the writer finds himself credited in your leaders of August 26th, and September 24th. I therefore claim the privilege of a rejoinder, in self-defence, if not self-justification. The justice of this plea you will allow after this disclaimer. We say that such legislation as the Contagious Diseases Acts, should have been enacted only as a *dernier ressort;* that our legislators have delivered their attack on prostitution by means of a "forlorn hope," instead of sapping and mining the approaches to the strongholds of Satan. They have begun at the extremity of the social scale, and have legislated for a class, while insisting that their enactments are *pro bono publico*. To this end they brand the irreclaimable, and the reluctant wanderer from the path of rectitude, with the self-same social stigma. The imprisonment of juvenile offenders has been found to be no deterrent against petty theft and window-breaking. So these Acts, by the association of those whose first slip has probably been fatal in its consequences, with the hardened and oft-convicted subject, convert the former into permanent recruits of the rank and file.

The simile of the "good ship" in quarantine, does not hold good as extended in your issue of September 24th. It is not a question of landing the passengers for the saving of their lives, so much as it is one of systematic distribution of irreformable characters, with facilities guaranteed to them for the prosecution of their deadly calling. The "Bridge of Sighs" to which I alluded led to dungeons from which the "gates of death" were the only exit. Nor are the passengers finally rescued from the stream of human "passions" as a person is rescued from a watery grave—they are only rescued temporarily from the "tide of immorality," to be shortly again sent adrift upon the dark waters, and thus advanced a stage on their journey to the gulf, from which there is no deliverance. "Adrift on the black wild tide" is the title of a narrative published last year by an American chaplain, and describes his recollections of the state of trance or coma which followed an attack of yellow fever. After being pronounced a corpse, and laid out for dead, he recovered and gave the world the benefit of his strange experiences during his apparent state of insensibility. And it was to the title of his publication that I owed the illustration to which you demur, and to which—as adapted in your issue of a month ago—I can trace no resemblance, none, that is, germane to the argument. Those who are unhappily confirmed in their evil courses court recognition. Notoriety is their stock-in-trade, it advertises their wares, and so draws customers. Police surveillance does not deter them. The Girls' Friendly Society works on different lines, and the argument in favour of such societies and against the Acts is that the former act as deterring influences over those amenable to such good offices, while the latter give prostitutes a *locus standi*, affording facilities for the pursuit of their occupation, and bringing malign influences to bear on those whose first fall has thrown them into the way of being hardened in a

course of sin, by the degrading influences with which they are brought into contact. The State can make no distinction in its treatment of different cases; its machinery once set in motion, the wheels of Juggernaut are not more indiscriminate, the bed of Procrustes not more inconsiderate than its unswerving action. Material influences govern the material world; moral influences the spiritual—a distinction not sufficiently borne in mind by the advocates of sanitary legislation, or, by the licensing of brothels and lock hospitals, &c, they would not fail to see how, by the enactment of the inevitable regulation "Let birds of a feather be herded together," they stamp upon the individual the indelible stains of the class, and render amendment impracticable.

My "logic" has reference to the *moral* influences brought to bear upon the culprit. I argue that both the legislature, and society in general, by caring only for the health of the moral and social castaway, impress upon the sinner against society and morals, that however heinous it may be to contract disease, a wholesome form of vice—if such a thing exists—may be "endured," nay,

> "Pitied and embraced!
> How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds
> Makes ill deeds done!"

But the same facilities afforded for the breach of another commandment, the eighth, are not so leniently regarded by society and the law, as I am not aware that theft by a prostitute from the person of her paramour, is exonerated on the score of temptation.

I cannot help it if my "logic" seems as worthless as my "Gospel" is unsound. My plea amounted to no more than this—a natural inference from other parts of Scripture, especially the writings of St. Paul—that the words "καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία," must not be separated from their context, "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ," or the whole of the argument in Ephes. ii. 14—17, would fall to the ground. I cannot "preach peace to them which are afar off," if I am to take my theology from the Bible, in order to conciliate those whose "gospel" is contained in a human paraphrase of the "good tidings of great joy," which resolves it into the Latin motto *pro bono publico*. I had rather take my text from the first lesson for last Sunday morning, or one of the two following chapters, and, dividing my subject into two parts, cause and effect, state the first in the words: "Because they have committed a trespass;" and the second, "I will make the land desolate, saith the Lord God." Those who follow any other course in this matter, seem to me to frustrate the scheme of redemption, as far as lies in human nature to annul it, by substituting some temporal, transient, and undefined "good" for that revealed to man in the Gospel.

I have not left myself space, on the present occasion, to deal with the suggested remedies, or to propose others; but I believe that difficulties would disappear in such matters of detail as soon as the nation proved itself in earnest in the salutary work of localising, if it could not entirely eradicate, the evil. If permitted, however, I shall have some suggestions to offer later. For the present I should wish to add that I do not think "An Irishwoman" has made use of one of the best arguments from Scripture which occur to me at the moment against polygamy, nor have you gone to the root of those she briefly and somewhat faintly indicated. Your correspondent would do well to combat the movement for legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which is more imminent and equally dangerous with the advocacy of polygamy, and may lead to it in one of its worst types. My first argument against the latter will lead up to one against both agitations.

Those who advocate either, or that American institution known as "Marriage by contract for a term of years," discredit their Christianity by arguing that marriage is unfettered under the Gospel by any restrictions not imposed under the law. I should deem that argument worthy of Malthus, and similar students of the "Science of Life," its mysteries and problems, not of students of the Old and New Testaments. If God instituted monogamy, as the happiest condition of man, when he was still perfect, and made woman out of man, "for to make of twain one flesh," polygamy must be regarded as a sign of such deterioration from man's first estate, as to verify the wise man's words, "God made man perfect, but man has sought out many inventions." But my first argument is that "God hath consecrated marriage to such an excellent mystery that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage betwixt Christ and His Church" (*vide* last collect in the Marriage Service). Either we must accuse the Apostle of debasing and materialising the spiritual union between Christ and His Church, the last writer in the New Testament capable of endorsing materialistic views, or we must acknowledge that he spoke by virtue of the authority of a divine revelation. The writer of 1 Cor. vii., would not have compared so excellent a mystery, to a mere carnal symbol. Marriage would have no semblance to Christ's relations to the Church, if it were no more than a carnal bond. No elements of comparison can exist between polygamy and such relations. Besides we must distinguish between what the Apostle spoke "by permission," and what "of commandment." And my second argument, which I must content myself by simply indicating—is that discrimination between what is "lawful" and what "expedient" or otherwise is now vested in Christ's Church on earth.

VERITAS.

Long Acre, E.C., October 24th, 1881.

Reviews and Notices.

"OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY OF REDEMPTION." Lectures by Franz Delitzsch, Professor of Theology, Leipzig. Translated from MS. Notes by S. I. Curtiss, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Edinburgh: P. and T. Clark. 1881. Pp. xv. 213.

The esteem felt in this country for Professor Delitzsch, as an orthodox Biblical critic and expositor, is sufficient to insure a welcome for any new work from his pen. In the case of the book now before us, it is true that some allowance needs to be made for the character imposed upon it by the fact that it is not a reproduction in English of a work which the author himself had completed for publication, but only a translation, in rather too Germanized a style, of a manual or body of notes, used in the delivery of lectures, and probably supplemented by oral explanations and links of connection. The natural consequence is that as a printed treatise it is too condensed, abrupt, and fragmentary to be altogether satisfactory, and it leaves a good deal to be desired. On the other hand, as the subject covers the whole field of Hebrew Revelation, it necessarily brings the lecturer into con-

tact with many of the modern problems of Biblical exegesis, and furnishes indications of his present position in regard of what is called the "higher criticism." To those who watch with interest the conflict between the traditional and modern schools of interpretation, it cannot but be important to note how far one of the most strenuous opponents of the negative and disintegrating theories of sceptical German critics has felt himself constrained to modify the views which used to be considered exclusively orthodox.

The object of the lectures is to sketch out the divine preparation, carried on through all the ages prior to Christianity, for the dispensation of grace in Christ. Besides the chief source of information in the canonical Scriptures, the materials are drawn from the monuments of the great empires contemporaneous with Israel, from the apocryphal books, and from the historical notices of the growth of Jewish thought in the interval between the two Testaments. The progressive preparation for Christianity is mapped out into seven epochs, bearing an analogy to the seven days of Creation. I. From the Creation to Abraham. II. The patriarchal period. III. The development and settlement of Israel as a nation. IV. The reigns of David and Solomon. V. Israel's conflicts with the world-empires—the prophetic age. VI. The post-exilic period, down to the death on Calvary. VII. The repose of Jesus in the grave—the concluding Sabbath of the Old Testament history. To follow the Professor through his review of this long and gradual unfolding of the divine redeeming purpose is, of course, impracticable in the present brief notice; and we shall confine ourselves to a brief indication of his views on some of the points in debate between the old and new schools of Biblical criticism.

The direct Messianic element in the Old Testament occupies of necessity a very large space in the lectures, and here we find the following expressions of opinion. The prophecy of Balaam is "the first properly Messianic prediction," the earliest that intimates a personal Redeemer. Hence the traditional interpretation of the famous passage about Shiloh is abandoned, and the modern translation of it is adopted, "until he (Judah) come to Shiloh," instead of "until Shiloh come." The earlier Messianic Psalms ascribed to David, notably Ps. xxii., "are Messianic on account of David's Messianic view of himself. He regarded himself as the Messiah of God." That is, they refer in the first instance to David himself, and "even where the spirit of prophecy typically elevates the expressions of David concerning himself to prophecy, the Messiah has no objectivity apart from David or above him." Not till after his sin with Bathsheba "was the image of the Messiah separated from his subjectivity, and came before him as a majestic form of the future." The glowing Psalm xlv. is connected with the marriage of Joram the son of Jehoshaphat, and thus is made to point, not directly, but typically, to Christ. Passing on, we find a recognition of the modern division of the Book of Isaiah between the historical Isaiah and the "deutero-Isaiah" of the captivity, and the following is the explanation given of the "Servant of the Lord" in the prophecies of the latter:—"The conception of the Servant of Jehovah in Is. xl.—lxvi., with respect to its lowest broad basis, is entire Israel; with respect to its centre, it is the congregation remaining true to God, which in the midst of the dispersion is the scattered seed of the future congregation growing together from Israel and the heathen. From this centre the conception becomes personal. Its pyramidal apex is the future Christ, in whom the sufferings of the congregation of Jehovah are reproduced and culminate, and by whom Israel's redemptive calling is completed." Of the Book of Daniel we are told that "weighty reasons are favourable to the composition of the Danielian apocalypse, as we now have it, about the year 170 B.C."; that it "is a book of consolation for the confessors and martyrs of the time of the Seleucidæ"; and that "it does not know an antichrist of a final period beyond Antiochus Epiphanes."

Akin to these remarks about the Books of Isaiah and Daniel are the opinions of Delitzsch concerning some other portions of the Old Testament. While abstaining from the enunciation of any definite scheme of the growth of the Pentateuch, as we now have it, he recognises in the Law or Tora which it contains successive "stages of development," various "forms and codifications," the Book of the Covenant in Ex. xx.—xxiii. being "the fundamental compendium of the Sinaitic Tora." He ascribes the Book of Job to the time of Solomon, "the new age of wisdom," classing it with the contemporary "Canticles" and "Proverbs" as "not specifically Israelitic, but placed on the basis of pure humanity." "The allegorical interpretation of Canticles," he adds, "makes Solomon a prophet or a mystic, but he was neither the one nor the other." Ecclesiastes he relegates to the reign of "Artaxerxes II. Mnemon (405—359 B.C.). . . . The poor wise man, who through his wisdom saved the small city against the great king, is perhaps Themistocles. . . It stands midway between the canonical literature of the chokma [the wisdom-literature sometimes styled Sapiential] which it completes, and that which is apocryphal and post-Biblical." Of Ezekiel, the last "nine chapters form one of the greatest Biblical riddles. . . . Is his picture a Utopia? No, it is a prophecy, but one which has remained unfulfilled, and which in its present form never will be fulfilled, because the development of the history of salvation has run past the fulfilment." Once more, Esther, "whatever one may think of its historical character, is certainly a mirror of the form of Judaism among the dispersion of the second half of the Persian period. . . . and is a dreadful commentary in confirmation of the hatred of enemies, which the old Judaism claimed as its right."

We have only room to add two or three extracts of a miscellaneous character. Of the narrative of the Fall:—"It is not a point of the greatest importance whether we understand it literally or symbolically, but whether we consider the event which rendered the redemption necessary a historical fact or not." For the meaning of Jehovah in Ex. iii.:—Instead of "I am what I am," "I shall be what I shall be," "signifying from henceforth the One existing in the unlimited future, and in His being determining Himself with absolute freedom." Of the law of sacrifice:—It was "neither the first nor the chief thing in the legislation; was adopted as a concession from traditional usage; did not substitute the life of the sacrificed animal for the offerer's life, nor regard the slaughtering of the sacrificial animal as a punitive execution, or suffering of death as a punishment." This last quotation is compressed, but gives the sense almost in the words of the text, and we have adduced it because of its obviously important bearing, if sound, on the right statement of the doctrine of the Atonement.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHRISTIAN SOLUTION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

By the Very Rev. J. C. MACDONNELL, D.D., Rector of Misterton, Leicestershire, formerly Dean of Cashel.

Sermon Preached in Peterborough Cathedral.

"For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever; not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved."—Philemon 15, 16.

THE Jews of Thessalonica accused the Apostles of "turning the world upside down." "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." (Acts xvii. 6.) At first sight this seems a strange and groundless accusation—the malicious calumny of Jewish enemies. The disciples of Christ were specially men of peace. They obeyed the laws themselves, and taught all to obey even the heathen emperors as "powers ordained of God." Everywhere they preached "peace" and "good will." Nevertheless the accusation was not groundless. It showed an instinctive perception of the power and tendency of Christianity. Apparently it made war only upon religious creeds and ceremonies which had long lost their vitality. In reality it was a power destined silently and gradually to revolutionize the world, and change the framework of society; but it was to do so in a way which no one of that age could fully understand or anticipate.

We find an example of this in St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon. It is only a short private letter. It deals with no matters of public interest, but only with the return of a runaway slave. Probably many wonder at finding such a letter in the Canon of Scripture at all, and they perhaps think that this is owing solely to its author and not to its contents. Yet no portion of Scripture has done more to revolutionize society—to "turn" the old world of the Roman Empire "upside down." But like all the Apostolic teaching, it has done this indirectly, by teaching principles which, in the long run, were found to be inconsistent with existing institutions. Nor have these principles yet accomplished all their mission. There is work for them to do still in England, as of old in Greece and Rome. But this we shall see more clearly if we first examine briefly the Epistle itself. It is a letter addressed to Philemon and carried by Onesimus, and relates entirely to them and to their affairs. Who, then, were these men? Philemon was evidently a man of note in the Colossian Church; probably a wealthy citizen of Colossæ. He is called in verse 1 "Our dearly beloved, and fellow-labourer." In verse 2 St. Paul speaks of the "Church in his house." In verse 5 he speaks not only of his faith in Christ, but of his love to Christ's people. The whole tone of the Epistle shows that he was a loved Christian friend, as well as an influential patron of Christianity at Colossæ.

But who was Onesimus, the bearer and subject of this letter? He was a runaway slave. He had run away from his master Philemon, and, if we are to accept the interpretation given by Chrysostom to verse 18, he had robbed his master. He had certainly defrauded him of his services, and we must remember that at that time a slave himself and his work were part of the master's property—secured to him by law as much as his land or the furniture of his house. But Onesimus having run away from his master, had contrived to get to Rome. We can scarcely imagine anything so vile and miserable as the society to which such a castaway would be admitted at Rome. A great heathen writer of that age describes the way in which everything vile and wicked found its way to the capital as "into a sewer." This, which was true of higher classes of society, must have been worse among slaves. The very refuse of the world were to be found among them. Here, in the depth of his misery, the voice of some Christian friend must have reached Onesimus. Probably some Asiatic who had known him in Colossæ brought him to hear the preaching of St. Paul, and thus led to his conversion.

But what was the position of St. Paul at that time? He was a prisoner at Rome, but yet enjoying a large amount of freedom.* His friends had free access to him, and he was allowed to preach to all who came to him. He had every hope of being acquitted when his appeal to Cæsar came on for hearing; and therefore he wrote (in verse 22), "Withal prepare me also a lodging: for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you." Many were brought by him at that time to the knowledge of Christ. A little later, writing to the Philippians, he says: "The things which happened unto me have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the Gospel." (Phil. i. 12.) His view of Onesimus' conversion and character is given (in verse 11): "Which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me." So much did he prize his convert that he wished to retain him in his own service; but he felt that this would not be just to Philemon, whose slave he legally was, or wise treatment of Onesimus himself. He therefore insists on his convert not only repenting of the past, but, so far as was possible, making restitution by returning to the service of his master. An ardent minister of our day would probably have dispensed with this step, and thus left the breach between master and

* See Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

slave unhealed. But to insure Onesimus a kind reception or even more, St. Paul sent him with this letter, which was calculated to disarm Philemon's anger, and to insure the slave a welcome back to his old home.

This letter has often been the admiration of critics for its delicacy and tact, and true Christian courtesy. St. Paul asks Philemon (verse 15) to regard the running away as a Providential occurrence, which led to the conversion of Onesimus, and to his return, no longer as a servant merely, but as "a brother beloved," like Joseph (Gen. xlv. 5), who consoles his conscience-smitten brethren by saying —"Now therefore be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither: for God did send me before you to preserve life." Observe that St. Paul avoids enforcing his wishes as a right; but pleads warmly his age and his sufferings for Christ. (Verses 8 and 9.) Again, he says, verse 17, "Receive him as *myself*." At the same time he gently and delicately reminds Philemon of those obligations to himself in things spiritual, which are beyond any earthly standard of valuation. "Albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides." Observe he does not ask for the manumission, or liberty of the slave, but only for his kind and Christian reception. He leaves the rest to the spontaneous overflow of Christian love, which he seems to anticipate in the words, verse 21: "Knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say."

Now what are the general principles taught here, which were destined, like a wedge, to force asunder at least one institution of society, and so far to "turn the world upside down?" There is no great doctrine of the faith proclaimed in this Epistle like those which make the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews the standards of Christian dogma. Nor is there any long series of Christian precepts, such as we find in those Epistles, to guide the believer in the pursuit of holiness. The Apostle here sinks the teacher in the affectionate friend, and pleads for an act of love and clemency. It is this which constitutes the Epistle a new point of departure in the history of the world. It is a new application of our Lord's parting precept—"This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." Those who first heard these words would probably never have dreamed of applying them in such a case. They might have asked the question, "How often shall my *brother* sin against me and I forgive him?" but they would not contemplate for a moment the necessity of exercising any clemency to a Gentile, a Samaritan, or a slave. Yet St. Paul said not a word against slavery as an institution; he merely taught a new feeling between master and slave. It is remarkable that the two Epistles which were penned at the same time and despatched from Rome by the same messenger are full of the same spirit. In the Epistle to the Colossians (iii. 22, 23, and iv. 1): "Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God: and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men. . . Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." And to the Ephesians he gives the same precept in almost the same words. It was the first practical step to that great social revolution of which his words in the same Epistle may be considered to be the charter (Col. iii. 11): "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all"—or, as he puts it in writing to the Galatians (iii. 28): "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Let anyone compare this breaking down of the barriers between race and social rank, and sex, not only with the civilised society of St. Paul's time, but with Oriental society in our day, where Christianity has not prevailed, and he will understand the vast revolution which was heralded by these words, and which in our time and country has long become an accomplished fact.

How, then, was all this brought about? Neither Christ nor His Apostles assailed the existing framework of society. But Christ founded a new Kingdom; "not of this world," for it was a spiritual society, moving in an entirely different sphere from earthly governments. The Church sought only to convince the reason and sway the consciences of men. Its only penalty was exclusion from its privileges and sacraments, which the outer world cared nothing about. But Christians were members of both societies—they were at the same time subjects of Pagan emperors and disciples of Christ. It was impossible for them not to apply to the institutions of civil society the principles which they had learned in their new and more heavenly polity. Thus Christianity, though not assailing existing institutions, brought a new and powerful light to bear upon them, which revealed their evils and deformities. They were no longer capable of satisfying the more enlightened views of men trained in the school of Christ.

Thus it was with masters and slaves. Their relative positions were nominally unchanged; but how could the master, as before, despise and ill-treat a slave who had the same Master in heaven? How could the slave, as before, crouch before a master who acknowledged himself to be his brother in Christ Jesus—an heir of the same promise and hope. Thus Christianity, wherever its spirit penetrated, did for other slaves what St. Paul did for Onesimus—it did not strike off at once their legal fetters, but it procured for them kind consideration, tenderness, and sympathy. We know how all this ended. After putting the Gentile on a religious

equality with the Jew, and raising woman from her Oriental bondage and inferiority, it inflicted a deadly blow upon slavery as an institution. It did in reality "turn the world upside down," and break up the framework of the Old Roman world, bound up as it was with heathenism and slavery. But having done this, has it accomplished its social mission? Are these great principles of Christian love exhausted, and have they nothing to do with the great struggles between property and poverty, capital and labour, not to speak of other social struggles between classes and races, which are still the source of bitter strife, and often the moving causes of assassination and war?

We are perhaps too ready either to acquiesce in many of the miseries and anomalies of our social condition, or to think we can mend them by violent change. Those who have much, generally wish to preserve things unchanged; while those who have little, think that every change must bring them good. You know how many violent changes have been proposed to remedy the inequalities of human life. The socialist would destroy the power, and divide the riches of the wealthy, in the vain hope of increasing thereby the happiness and comfort of the poor. But all such efforts, including the contests of capital and labour, have had the sad result of dividing men into hostile camps, and arraying one class against another. It was not thus that slavery was abolished. No servile war ever ended in the permanent emancipation of the slave. It was Christian love and brotherly kindness which melted the chains that violence had been unable to break. And so it will be still. Other difficulties will be conquered if they are to be conquered at all by the wider diffusion of a Christian spirit, and an appreciation of the rights of others. Christianity aims at the same results as socialism; the raising of those that are lowest in the social scale to the highest possible level of intelligence and prosperity; but it denounces as wicked and impossible all attempts to build the prosperity of the poor upon the spoliation and degradation of the rich. It seeks to infuse into hostile classes the spirit of justice and brotherly love. It binds together those whom others seek to separate and estrange.

If it succeeded in remedying the relation of master and slave, is there any sore in human society that can be pronounced incurable by it? The disease which political quacks vainly tamper with, may by God's blessing yield to the soothing remedies of Gospel teaching, and Christian love. But assuredly we need a tenfold measure of the spirit of this Epistle to soften the inequalities and sweeten all the relations of human life—to remove on the one side pride and oppression and contempt; and to exorcise on the other the demons of envy, discontent and hatred.

It has been said that hypocrisy is the homage which vice pays to virtue. And assuredly wickedness and infidelity have often paid homage to Christianity by stealing its watchwords and aping its spirit. No violent revolution has been attempted in the past century, without adopting as its motto the truly Christian words "liberty," "equality," "fraternity;" words which if rightly understood, breathe the very spirit of the Gospel. The Gospel seeks to establish true liberty, genuine equality, a real brotherhood. The socialist schemes are but a caricature of what Christianity aims at, and accomplishes so far as men really adopt its principles. Both have something in common in their professed aim; but while one seeks its end through the violent destruction of existing institutions and existing rights, the other works from within and seeks to infuse a new spirit into all.

How then is the Spirit of this Epistle to Philemon to be cherished in ourselves, and communicated to others? How is the softening influence of true Christian "fraternity" to be brought to bear upon the inequalities of human life, and the social struggles which are going on in every corner of Christendom? We are met here by the difficulty which meets us when we endeavour to teach or practise any of the higher and more heavenly precepts of Christianity. We cannot rekindle or keep them burning apart from that Christian faith and spiritual life which are the motive powers of the Gospel. We cannot teach the spirit of such precepts by merely explaining and recommending them. When that alone is done, Christianity becomes merely a revival of the law—a legal system with a higher morality and higher sanction, but a legal system still. It is only when we realise and act up to our relation as members of Christ and children of God, that all the duties of life fall into their allotted places and are performed in a Christian spirit. It is their common attraction to the sun which keeps the planets in their orbits and prevents their clashing with one another as they run their appointed course. So it is their living union with Christ, and their communion of the Holy Spirit, which alone can keep all the gradations of society in mutual harmony and lovingkindness. We may look back to St. Paul's precept about the duties of masters and slaves, and to the embodiment of those precepts in his dealings with Philemon and Onesimus, for the origin of many of the blessings which we enjoy in a Christian country. But we must look further back to the common bond which bound Paul and Philemon and Onesimus to Christ, and so to one another, for the spirit in which this teaching was given and received.

And so, when we would heal the wounds of our social system and soften the asperities of life, this is only partially and imperfectly done, except so far as Christ is recognised and accepted as a "Prince and a Saviour"—the supreme head and Redeemer of the great Christian family. Yes, there are doubtless many palliatives for the ills of

life, many partial remedies for the bitterness of social inequality. We must wish God-speed to those who endeavour in any way, by lawful means, to lighten the inevitable burdens of mankind. But we cannot realise our true relation to one another without vital union with Christ our Head.

As we gaze on Him, as we trust in Him, for time and for eternity, there spreads around an ever-widening circle of self-denying charity, self-sacrificing love. Even the meanest and most degraded of mankind we regard with pitying affection, as one having an immortal soul to be saved, as one for whom Christ died. And if the spirit of grace lead him to the Saviour, and enable him to walk as a disciple of Christ, we regard him (to use St. Paul's words) "no longer as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved"—another stone fitted into that holy temple in the Lord; in whom all true believers "are builded together for an habitation of God, through the Spirit." (Ephes. ii. 22.)

OVER-ANXIETY.

By the Rev. J. A. CARR, LL.D., Rector of Whitechurch, Co. Dublin.

Sermon Preached at Whitechurch on Sunday, Sept. 25th, 1881.

"Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." —St. Matt. vi. 31—34.

THE passage of which this is the close would seem at first sight to teach a doctrine for which the Bible really gives no sanction whatever, namely, the doctrine of fatalism, the Kismet of the Mahomedans—"it is the will of Allah"—that is to say, that we are to take things as they come, do nothing to further our own interests, live a passive, inactive life, trust in God, and wait quietly from day to day to see what He will do for us. "Take no thought for your life what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on." "Take no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Live the life of the grass of the field and of the fowl of the air, be as little concerned as they are as to what shall happen, what shall be to-morrow; hold your hands and take things quietly; trust to chance, something will be sure to turn up. Now I need hardly say that this is very far from being the meaning of this passage, and that no such doctrine, which would ignore and suppress the best part of our nature, ever fell from the lips of Jesus Christ. In no part of the Bible shall be found such a mischievous and misleading quietism. On the contrary, the teaching of Scripture is all the other way: it consistently inculcates a busy and a diligent life. It tells us that if we do not work neither shall we eat; it exhorts us, even while we are serving God, to be diligent in business and fervent in spirit. What then, it may be asked, is our Lord urging upon them when He thus exhorts the subjects of the new kingdom which He came into the world to establish, to take no thought about the most important and elementary businesses of life? The truth is, our Lord is here guarding us against over-anxiety about worldly things; against that temptation into which every man is liable to fall, and more especially those who are ardent and shrewd in the affairs of this life, of subordinating the interests of the world to come to those of the present, putting our earthly substance—what our Lord calls "Mammon"—in the place of God, or else dividing our allegiance between the two. "No man," says our Lord, "can serve two masters." You cannot be the devoted servant of God and of this world at the same time; one or other must have the supreme place in your affections. If we ask what is the serving of Mammon against which our Lord here warns us, the answer is plain, it is the inordinate thinking about earthly things as if they were everything; it is the reversing of that order of life which is laid down elsewhere in this chapter, and the seeking first the things of this world, and next the things of the world to come; it is the putting of the latter into the background, and saying—the world and its interests first, and then by-and-bye, if there should be time and opportunity for them, the interests of the future life. Now as opposed to the principle of thus ordering our existence, we find our Lord saying, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." The lesson, then, to be taken out of the words is this, that it is our business as Christian men, and our wisest and happiest policy, to subordinate the interests of time to those of eternity, to prefer the Divine before the human, the unseen before the visible, the spiritual before the material, and that in doing this we shall in the long run come on that course of true prosperity and happiness which it is the natural desire of every man to aim after. There are two extremes, then, which we have to guard against in going through life: the one doing nothing, trusting everything to God, and thus abusing the great truth of the Divine Providence; the other acting as if everything depended on ourselves, and as if there were no need to look to a higher power than ourselves for help and guidance in the great affairs and trials of life. Now the very grass of the field, and the fowl of the air, to which our Lord appeals as affording evidence of the gracious oversight and constant goodness of God may teach us the right mean between these two extremes. It is true, as our Lord says here of the

grass of the field, that it neither toils nor spins, and yet it is arrayed in gorgeous colours—colours so bright and glowing that even Solomon in all the magnificence of his raiment could not vie with them. But even the grass of the field, we must remember, is not a passive creature in this matter, but according to the law of its nature is always busy assimilating out of the earth those elements which go to constitute its life and vigour, and drawing from the sun and air the brilliancy of its colouring. By its roots it draws up the nourishment it needs from the salts and alkalies embedded in the earth, feeding on some and discarding others, and thus it grows in obedience to the law of its own nature, fulfilling its purpose in the great order of things. So again with the birds of the air. It is true "they sow not neither do they spin, nor gather into barns; yet God feedeth them." But how does He feed them? It is by implanting instincts within them, in the following out of which they pursue their respective food, whether it be the eagle sweeping upon its quarry and tearing it with rapacious claw, or the more humble denizens of the air picking up the random worm or chasing the butterfly in its vagrant flight. From one point of view these creatures of God's handiwork may appear to be quite passive in the matter of existence, but from another point of view we see them all actively engaged, working out the law of their being, and nourished and brought to perfection only by a lively anticipation of their respective wants. And this in truth is the lesson which our Lord would impress upon us in this passage—dependence upon God, even as the grass of the field and the fowl of the air depend upon His beneficence and goodness, at the same time that we endeavour earnestly and dutifully to discharge our various obligations, evermore remembering that that law has never been reversed which requires that by the sweat of his brow man must earn his daily bread. The Christian, then, must guard against over-anxiety on the one hand, and a false presumption on the other. Our Lord, as a true teacher, recognises the golden mean; He recognises things as they are. His discourses were not adapted for an ideal world, but for this work-a-day toilsome world of ours, in which men have their cares and necessities, and must toil to provide for them. He speaks to us in a homely way about our food, and our drink, and our clothes: they are prime necessities, we cannot do without them; but our Lord would remind us that they are not everything. There is something higher and better and more important than eating and drinking and clothing ourselves, and getting rich and comfortable. Yet how many are there in this world who make these things everything; expend treasures on luscious meats and luxurious wines, and expensive apparel while Christ's poor are dying in want, and starving children are asking for bread. But it is not so much to this class of people our Lord speaks here as to those whose means are limited, who have not much of this world's wealth, and who are therefore naturally anxious about the elementary necessities of life. He tells such not to be over-anxious on the subject, but trust all to God. He reminds them of the existence of their "Heavenly Father." "Your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." As was always the way with our Saviour, He would have men look up, have faith in God, believe that they have a Heavenly Father who loves them, and will not suffer them to want. Put your trust in your Heavenly Father, He knows all about you, He knows your resources, He knows your secret cares, and when you most need He will come to your relief. He who feeds the fowl of the air who come and go on the viewless paths of the wind; He who clothes the lily of the field with its sweet beauty, will He not feed you, oh ye of little faith! This is the lesson we all need to learn more or less; we require to realize the interest God takes in us, and to believe that our welfare and our happiness are not matters of indifference to Him. We require to feel that He is always with us, and that our temporal affairs are in His hands, and are His care and interest just as truly as are our spiritual needs. How much it would heighten and elevate and sanctify life if we thus brought God more into it, if we thought of Him at all times—at our business, no matter how homely—whether following the plough, or handling the spade, or holding the pen, or sitting at the desk. If we thought thus:—"It is God who is giving me the daily strength for my work, it is God who maintains my intellect unimpaired, He who nerves my brain, He who braces my muscles, He who guides me day by day, preserves and upholds me, in whom I live and move and have my being! He loves me, that great God high and lifted up: the mighty God, the Creator of the ends of the earth, He who guides the stars in their courses through the heavens, He remembers me, and, amid all the great concernments of His mighty empire, He can afford to think upon me—He knows me, He knows who I am, where I live, how I am occupied from day to day—He knows my peculiar wants and temptations, my trials and struggles, my efforts to overcome my natural weaknesses—my besetting sins; He hears my poor broken prayers, and though they are only too often weak and wandering petitions, yet they ascend to the throne of grace, and are heard in heaven! Yes, God is my Father and my Friend; He loves me, and because He loves me He gave His Son to die for my sins." This is what is required of us, brethren, to realize more deeply this relationship of God toward us, to individualise for ourselves the paternal regard of our Creator, to think of Him as Christ teaches us here to think of Him, as our Heavenly Father our tender-hearted God, our compassionate

Saviour, Who, since He cares for the grass of the field and the fowl of the air, is quite certain to care for us!

For this reason, then, we are not to be over-anxious about the morrow, but leave to morrow to take care for the things of itself: we are not to anticipate possible troubles and losses, but to walk calmly in the present, confident that the loving care and protecting mercy of God shall be with us in the future as we have found them with us in the past. This, then, brethren is the lesson that these words of Christ would impress upon us—this is the lesson we are all called upon to learn and practise. We are all, indeed, too much inclined to be careful and troubled about many things: to be in danger of mistaking the real meaning of our Lord's words in this place. We must of necessity think about what we shall eat and what we shall drink, and wherewithal we shall be clothed. Uncertainties and anxieties on such subjects belong to the general evil which characterises the present state, but "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof;" we need not be always anticipating it, but rather believe that with the wants for to-morrow God will grant the supplies for to-morrow. "Seek ye first," says our Lord, in solemn tones, recognizing the deeper wants of the human soul, "seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." We are put into this world, after all, not to be absorbed and swallowed up in its cares, but to prepare for a better and a higher world. It is a terrible mistake to live as if this world were everything, and neglect due preparation for the world to come. Soon this world shall be all over for every one of us: soon its cares and anxieties shall no longer oppress us, and for better or for worse, we shall have gone out of it for ever. But still our spirits will be living on, in the presence of God, if we loved and cultivated that presence here; but assuredly anywhere but in that presence if we did not know and love God here. Be assured of this that death works no such magical transformation in any human character as that the man who, when living in this world, did not love and fear God, suddenly finds himself absorbed in the love of God, entranced and overcome by it in the world of spirits. No, brethren; we cultivate here the tempers and dispositions which characterise the invisible world of light and glory: it is here in this life that we plant our feet on the first step of the ladder "whose top reacheth to heaven."

On Tuesday week the Archbishop of York reopened the parish church of Ebberston, which had been restored by Mr. E. Christian. The edifice is one of very great antiquity—indeed it is said to boast some pre-Norman remains. There is a new east window, which is intended as a memorial of the Rev. R. Rudd, the late vicar, and his wife, both of whom had laboured zealously for the restoration of the church, and both had died in March, 1879.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160. Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XI. are now ready.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1881.

IN consequence of press of matter we this week devote a Supplement to the discussion of the Contagious Diseases Acts. This will enable such of our subscribers, as wish to do so, to keep this melancholy and repulsive, although vitally important, topic, from the eyes of those who know nothing of such evil, and to whom even the knowledge of its existence may be thought disadvantageous, if not actually mischievous. Did not the moral and physical evils of prostitution, as we have truthfully depicted them, concern every member of the Church, even the youngest and purest, whether male or female, for as regards the spread of disease we are all physically members one of another, we should be content, with the majority of the clergy and laity, who however do pray for the health of the people, to ignore, and by our silence to sanction, this great sin. If we are right in our belief that the morality of a nation depends a good deal on its physical health, and that strength of mind bears a direct proportion in most cases to strength of body, surely the clergy in the discharge of their proper high and holy function should strive to prevent not only the rampant polyandry in our midst, condemned alike by the laws of Nature and of Revelation, but also the physical diseases and deterioration of posterity which are incidental to it. The Church as well as the State should strive to further prevent this physical, and by consequence moral, evil by the extension of the Contagious Diseases Acts or some other more efficient measures. The Church has made great efforts to remedy the minor sin and evil of intemperance. With the Rev. R. Parrott, Vicar of Amwell, we should be glad to see the Church attempt to grapple with and suppress this much greater evil. For these reasons, at the urgent request of subscribers, opponents as well as supporters of the Contagious Diseases Acts, we have thought it right to allow a discussion on these and other suggested

remedies. This discussion must shortly close. Meanwhile, to meet the wishes of those who hold the maxim σύνετα συνετοῖσιν, and think this question does not concern them, we will relegate it to a moveable supplement.

CHURCH CONGRESS.

"The Claims of the Revised Version of the New Testament to General Acceptance."

By The Rev. W. SANDAY, Principal of Hatfield Hall, Durham.

I cannot refrain, even at the cost of not being strictly relevant, from beginning the few remarks I have to make with a word of congratulation—not so much upon the happy completion of the Revision itself, on which congratulations have naturally been many, but upon another matter about which less has been said than might have been expected—the very remarkable amount of interest with which the Revised Version has been received. We live in anxious and in some respects gloomy times, and some of the best men among us are inclined to be prophets of evil. But the simple fact of the enormous circulation which the Revised Version has attained—something like 2,000,000, I suppose, in the first few weeks, and I do not know how much more since—this simple fact, with the evidence of real earnestness and zeal in the study of the version, must be said to be a hopeful sign for the religious future of our race. What other European people would have bought up 2,000,000 New Testaments in a few weeks? The test may seem a coarse one, but in estimating the extent and depth of national feeling the coarsest tests are often the truest. Vague general impressions are worth little in comparison with them. But if we may trust this very tangible proof, the head of the nation must still be sound. There must be a core of serious and earnest Christianity which all the disintegrating forces of modern life have not deeply injured. To be assured of this is much, and it is still more to think of the almost boundless influence for good which a renewed and deepened study of the Bible may exercise just at this particular crisis of our Church's history. We have had a revival of Reformation Christianity; we have had a revival of the Mediæval Christianity; and now there seems good ground to hope that we may have a revival of Biblical Christianity in all its length and breadth, and with newly realised freshness and power. So long as the other two movements are kept in close contact with this, I am not afraid that either of them will be carried to any really pernicious extreme. This great Biblical movement seems to be now well under way. And the revision at Westminster, while it is one of the most striking symptoms of it, also cannot fail to give it a powerful impulse. The theme is a tempting one, and a generalisation of this kind naturally needs limitation and qualification, but I must leave it and hasten to come to our main subject—the claims of the Revised Version to general acceptance. And here I think I shall best meet what will be expected of me if I endeavour to give an answer to three questions. (1.) What are the merits of the Revised Version as the basis of its claim to acceptance? (2.) Is it desirable that it should be authorised for use in public worship? (3.) Ought it to undergo any further revision? (1.) As regards the merits of the Version, I shall not attempt to go into any details, or to traverse again ground that I have gone over or am about to go over elsewhere. But I will try to give a sort of summary view of my own impression at the present moment. It is an impression which would be in some particulars open to correction. I cannot profess to have given a close study either to all parts or to all aspects of the New Version. So far as I have written upon the subject, I have taken up those sides of it with which I felt most competent to deal, leaving it to others to do the same. That which I have gone into most thoroughly is the Text—the Revised Greek Text upon which the new translation is based. It is a well-known fact that the vast accumulation of material on the one hand, and the more scientific treatment of textual criticism on the other, had made a revision necessary. I have tried to ascertain in an article that appears in the current number of the *Expositor* how that revision has been carried out. On the whole, it would seem as if the text which has been taken as the foundation of the New Version was, so far as the present state of our knowledge would enable us to judge, decidedly good. The principles followed are such as seem to be in the main sound, and they have been followed with a considerable amount of tact, and with just that degree of caution which most of us would wish to see exercised. The question may indeed be raised, as I have pointed out elsewhere, whether the moment chosen for the revision was the happiest possible. If it could have been delayed a little longer, the results obtained might have possessed a greater degree of stability and certainty. An event of great importance in the history of textual criticism has happened in part simultaneously with the appearance of the revision, and in part during the last month—I mean the publication of the Greek Text, with its accompanying volume of introduction and appendix, by Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort. Whatever may be in our own particular views, and whatever may be the ultimate decision on the text of the New Testament, there can be no question that this is a work of quite astonishing science and skill, and that it must for all time rank high among the best productions of English theological scholarship. But the fullest recognition of this will still leave room for regret that there had not been a little more time for the principles thus laid down to be thoroughly ventilated, discussed, and sifted. In another ten years or twenty years' time they may come to be generally accepted truths, as much accepted as the law of gravitation. And if that should be so, it would evidently have been a great advantage for the revisers to be able to assume them; just as in the opposite case, supposing the possibility (I can hardly think of it as more than a possibility) that they should be refuted, that too would have been a clear advantage. The misfortune is that there should still be a certain degree of uncertainty in the matter, and considering that there is this uncertainty, and making due allowance for it, I cannot but think that the revisers have done exceedingly well, and that it would have been difficult for them to do much better. Passing from the text to the translation, I am afraid I must confess to a more mixed feeling. There can be no doubt that the work has been most conscientiously and thoroughly done. The names of the revisers were a guarantee for excellent scholarship and large exegetical knowledge. I myself have learnt much, and hope to learn much more from the Revised Version. Of some

aspects of it I hardly feel qualified to judge, or at least, not to pronounce at all positively. But I regret to find that other scholars more accomplished than myself have taken some exception to it even upon the score of accuracy, and I am obliged to say that some of the criticisms—a rather larger proportion than I expected—seem to me to be well founded. One is indeed apt, in considering detailed criticisms of this kind, to lay more stress upon the isolated instances which provoke question than upon the multitude of others that are passed over in tacit acquiescence; and the severest critic of the New Version would no doubt admit not only that, taken as a whole, it is far more faithful than the Old, but so far as accuracy is concerned the percentage of doubtful changes, as compared with the clear improvements, is small. Still there would seem to be some flaws that need not have been there, and that if any opportunity should be given for further correction, might without difficulty be removed. My own feeling is that rather too much has been sacrificed, I do not say to accuracy, but to a particular conception of the demands of accuracy. Taking the work as a whole, there are, I suppose, many more changes than most of us expected to see. And in regard to not a few of these, I suspect that we should have been quite satisfied if they had not been made. No doubt it was well to fix a high ideal; but was the ideal pursued quite the one that was most appropriate to the purpose? Is the version that is offered to us quite suited to fill the place that our English Bible has hitherto filled? It is certainly a popular version in one sense of the word. Very great pains have evidently been taken to bring home the full meaning of the Greek to every man, woman, and child of the English-speaking race. The Revisers seem to have done all they could to enable the English reader to use his English New Testament in the same way in which a scholar would use his Greek Testament. I cannot help thinking that rather too much has been done in this direction. There must still be Sunday schools and Bible classes and lectures on the Greek Testament; and there must also be points left to be explained; and whether one point more or one point less was left to be explained, would not seem to be of such very great importance. On the other hand it should not be forgotten that our English Bible is not merely a translation from the Hebrew and from the Greek. It is also the greatest and most sacred of English classics, and I cannot repress the feeling that in this respect it has somewhat suffered. It seems to me to have lost something of the dignity and beauty, the ease and naturalness of its style, in the attempt to place the English reader in the same position as the Greek scholar. No doubt, to a certain extent, the loss was inevitable; and even where it was not inevitable, I am quite aware that much may be said in defence of the Revisers. It will be impossible for me to enter into any further discussion of the question at present. I shall have occasion to do so at length in one of the later papers of the series to which I am contributing in the *Expositor*. It seems to me, however, in any case, that this is the weakest side of the New Version; just as its strongest side will, I believe, be seen when it is regarded less as a version than as a commentary. We have now, as some one remarked the other day, a commentary shorter even than Bengel's. And it possesses other unique advantages. It is made from a much better Greek text than either Bengel's, Meyer's, or De Wette's. It is the product not merely of one but a number of minds, sitting round the council table and discussing each point as it arose. Due recognition has been given to dissentient views, and care has been taken to distinguish between what may be regarded as practically certain and what must be held to be comparatively doubtful. If a few corrections were made, which only the very best scholars would be competent to make, then I doubt if it would be possible to find a commentary so concise, so exact, and so judicial. This seems to me to be the great gain, and the diminished force, flexibility, and beauty of the English the corresponding loss. I may sum up the total impression made upon me briefly thus:—The text good, with proper and natural caution, the translation extremely careful, highly instructive, but though accurate, not quite perfectly so, and the style, I cannot but think, after weighing as well as I can all that has been said and can be said for it, somewhat defective. (2.) These characteristics, if a right estimate has been placed upon them, may perhaps help to supply an answer to the second question, Is it well that the Revised Version should be authorised for use in public worship? I assume that in any case only a permissive authorisation would be thought of. No one would wish to debar from the use of the Old Version those who honestly prefer it. But even in this limited sense, is it desirable that the New Version should be legally authorised? The first argument that is apt to strike us will seem to some as if it must be all but conclusive. There can be no question that the New Version is, both in text and rendering, far more accurate than the Old. But accuracy is truth. And the obligations of truth would seem to be paramount above all others. It is the old story—*amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, magis amica Veritas*. Rhythm is good; richness and variety and nobility of diction are good; but better than all is truth. Can we say—or even seem to say—"It is written," when it is not written? To take an extreme case, is it possible to read the chapter 1 John v. as it stands in the Old Version, containing the text on the Three Heavenly Witnesses, without a pang of conscience? I can well understand the feelings of one to whom it was not possible. And yet this is an argument of a sweeping kind which, on consideration, we must feel to be dangerous and wrong to press. It is not capable of being applied by any means universally. If we look at the Divine Government of the world we shall see that though there is a tendency on the whole in the direction of truth, the higher or stricter truth is not allowed to supersede the lower in any abrupt or sudden way. It is a gradual process, often a slow process; and with such a process we too might well be content, especially in a case like this, where the Old Version is endeared to the affections of men by such long familiarity and so many sacred associations. Besides, there is another argument which meets that which has been just urged still more directly. That is not deceitful which is not intended to and does not deceive. Every Englishman has now an opportunity of checking the accuracy of the Old Version, and it is his own fault if he does not use it. It is easy to take to church the Revised Version, and follow the lessons verse by verse, mentally correcting whatever would seem to need correction. Those who wish to be instructed will find few exercises more really profitable than to compare the two versions in this way. For such a purpose of quiet study the New Version is, as we have seen, especially well adapted. The very same causes tend to make it so, which make it

less suited for use in public worship. On the whole, then, as regards the authorisation of the New Version, I should deprecate anything like haste. As soon as the popular feeling is ripe for authorisation (if it should become ripe), and as soon as there is a clear demand for it, let the authorisation be issued, but not before. If the Revised Version is to take the place of the Old, it should do so gradually and naturally, without any forcing. Even if it should never be read in a single church, it will still have accomplished an immense work. If it does not find its way on to the lectern it will find its way into the pulpit; if it does not enter the church it will enter the household; if it has not a place by the fireside, it will have one, at least, in the study; and wherever it goes it must inevitably waken thought, and lead to a deeper and truer knowledge of God's Word. (3.) The question of authorisation is, however, intimately connected with the third and last of those which I set myself to consider—the question as to the advisability of further revision. The suggestion has been made in more than one influential quarter that the Revised Version should itself be revised. And here I am reminded that one of the rules laid down for the guidance of the Committee does not seem to have been strictly observed. The rule I mean is the 8th, which runs thus :—"To refer on the part of each company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions." I do not know that anything has appeared to show that this rule has been acted upon at all, except in the narrative of St. Paul's voyage and shipwreck. It can hardly have been acted upon to any great extent; and it is easy to imagine difficulties that might stand in the way. Yet we could most of us have counted off upon our fingers some ten or twelve names under the three heads of divines, scholars, and literary men, which for one reason or other could not be included in the original committee, but in regard to which this method of consultation might have been employed with great advantage. I may say in passing that I should certainly have claimed two of this number for the north country —our two north country contributors to the *Speaker's Commentary*—and one at least across the Border, Professor Jebb, of Glasgow, a scholar who is possessed of quite remarkable dexterity in the handling of English. If the proof sheets could have been sent round to a small number of select critics like these, we should then practically have had a further revision before the New Version was published. And I do not doubt that such a revision would have been final so far as our present knowledge can take us. But it would be another thing to appoint a new committee to reconsider the Revised Version now. If it should be thought well to appoint such a committee I do not think that it should be just at present. There are a number of questions afloat which are questions of principle, and which affect not only single passages but whole groups of passages. These questions will need time for their discussion, and it is much better that they should have time. For example, there is first and foremost the great question of text. If we wait some ten or twenty years there is quite a chance—a good chance—that that fundamental question may be to all intents and purposes settled. Then there are a number of grammatical questions, smaller in themselves, but in the aggregate considerable. The question as to the use of the article in such phrases as *ho nomos* is perhaps working itself out, but the great question as to the rendering of tenses, especially the *aorist*, has received a fresh impetus, and seems to be more open than ever. Then again such points as the rendering of the middle voice, the force of the termination *-ma*, the different uses of *hina* which have been recently raised in the last volume of the *Speaker's Commentary*, all seem to require discussion. In another quarter critics are pressing the claims of modern Greek as throwing light upon Hellenistic usage. This, too, seems to be worth considering and debating. Besides, I am acquainted with at least one very competent scholar, who is working hard on the philology of the New Testament by renewed research in contemporary or nearly contemporary writings. I believe he claims to have made some discoveries. Whether any, or how many, of these new views will stand investigation, remains to be seen; but it is at least well that the investigation should be made, that the views should be thoroughly weighed and tested, and either accepted or put aside. This could not possibly be done if a new committee were set to work at once. My advice, then, both as regards authorisation and revision, would be at once the easiest to give and the easiest to take—*that we should simply wait and let things take their natural course.* Twenty years is very little in the life of a nation or a church. And if about the year 1900 it should seem desirable to have a further revision, by all means let it be made. But in the meantime it would be doing the very greatest service if a few eminent scholars would place on record their criticisms on the present revision, and their suggestions for its improvement. And even others less eminent might combine together in groups up and down the country, especially at such centres as the Universities, and draw up suggestions which might prove of value. The interval of time would be well spent in digesting all this matter; and the committee, when it was appointed, would find the greater part of its work done ready to its hand. A revision so carried out would be truly national, and we might hope that it would prove in the future what the Old Version has been in the past, and what the present revision, with all its merits, seems just to fall short of being.

Chancellor Espin followed, and, after sketching some of the characteristics of the present revision as distinguished from that of King James's time, he entered at length into a discussion of the changes made by the Revisers in the text of the Authorised Version. He said that the principle laid down for them was to make as few alterations as possible consistently with faithfulness; and that it had been stated by the Bishop of Gloucester that the alterations made would hardly be perceptible to the general reader. But, in fact, there was hardly a parable, or a miracle, or a group of verses anywhere, which was not so altered as to make the alteration not only perceptible, but painfully so. Indeed, to listen to the reading of the Revised New Testament was to encounter an endless series of surprises and shocks. Again and again the word which ought to come was ousted, and a stranger stared us in the face instead. It was to him most unwelcome to find, not as few alterations as possible, but a great profusion of alterations everywhere apparent; and some of those changes appeared to him almost as though they were made for the sake of making them. In some cases he considered the volume lost in dignity more than it gained in accuracy. He thought the Revisers had hardly borne in mind the suggestion made by their chairman that the work would be so conducted that people should never be reminded in hearing the New Version that they were not listening to the Old,

for in reading the new edition they stumbled and paused at almost every turn, brought up by some alteration or transposition which seemed to mar the music of the familiar words. In some passages the new rendering was so vastly inferior to the old one, that one really marvelled how it could ever have passed the ordeal to which every proposal was most wisely subjected. It seemed to him that the work had suffered from the secrecy with which the revision was conducted. Probably that secrecy was indispensable, but, at the same time, it had deprived the Revisers of some robust common-sense criticism, which would have been of advantage to them. Certainly some hard passages had been very boldly taken in hand, but, he feared, not much improved. Having quoted various examples, he said he was sorry that those he had had to select had not been from amongst the felicities and the successes of the Revised New Testament. There were very many such, which he gratefully admitted. Perhaps they had been less acknowledged than they ought to have been, because they were for the most part expected beforehand, and had been long ago marked out as necessary. The great fault, in his mind, was the excessive and quite unlooked-for amount of change that was introduced. He did not think the Revisers had limited themselves to the removal of plain and clear errors ; and he could not but think that very many alterations introduced by them into the text ought to have been merely exhibited in the margin. Changes in the text only ought to have been made under pressure of clear, indeed imperious, necessity. As regarded the future of the Revised New Testament, they must pause awhile in their judgment. Its position in the Church could not be settled until they had the whole Bible before them. One could hardly think that, at any rate, it would ever displace for public use in the Church the present venerated and venerable Authorised Version. It probably would, however, secure an honoured, if a subsidiary, place amongst us. It would serve the purposes of a commentary. It would, by preserving throughout, one rendering for the same Greek word, greatly help in comparing Scripture with Scripture. It conferred a boon of the very greatest value upon the English reader, as being a more exact translation than any other extant, and as the work of deeply learned and specially skilled men, who had spent ten years upon it. The marvellous interest aroused by its publication had been one of the most cheering phenomena of our time, and had proved that the Christian religion was not that effete thing which some had dared to call it.

Both papers, which were of more than ordinary length, were listened to with the deepest attention throughout, and the sentiments expressed in them, though not in all respects quite similar, were frequently and loudly applauded. A discussion then ensued, which was commenced by Mr. Duncan, and continued by the Rev. J. T. Pearse, Head Master of Birkenhead School, and the Rev. Canon Saumarez Smith, until the time came for closing the proceedings.

CHESTER DIOCESAN CONFERENCE.

The closing session, on the 27th ult., was devoted to papers and discussion upon the " Revised Version of the New Testament." The subject was opened up in two papers by the Dean and the Chancellor—the former taking the more general aspects of the subject, the latter dealing with the Revised New Testament from the historical and critical point of view. The Dean said the first remark he would make was that much of this Revised Version had existed previously in a floating and diffused condition. They had in this small compact volume that which they indeed possessed before, but which was now digested, completed, and arranged. All intelligent Bible-readers had been aware of the corrections which were necessary both in the text and in the translations of the New Testament, of explanations required with regard to the use of words, with regard to the manners and customs, and in regard to the doctrines and precepts also. Before the publication of this version, such corrections and explanations had to be sought in various places, and in order to possess them properly it was requisite to read rather widely. The Dean then enlarged upon the convenience and advantage which the religious teacher would find in the Revised New Testament, and said it was gratifying to find that there had been no conflict with American divines in the matter ; the English emendations appeared as notes to the American editions of the Bible, and the American corrections as notes to the English version. It was also a matter of satisfaction to find that where the Revised Version differed from the unrevised, the latter was not contradicted in its meaning, while at the same time it was quite certain that we were now brought far nearer to the inspired writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles than we were previously. When it came to a question of taste and the form of expression, he would not presume to defend some of the alterations which had been made, but nevertheless he contended that a vast service had been done to students of the Bible the world over. Convenience, authority, charity, and hope ; these four words summed up the thoughts which had occurred to him as likely to be useful in connection with the subject before them, and they summed up very salutary lessons for the Sunday-school teacher, the Bible student, the English Churchman, and the English citizen. It was no light advantage in these feverish and preoccupied times to have an easy method of doing any part of our religious work. It was a greater benefit still to have a mind at ease in respect of any religious questions, and to be satisfied that they were in the way of light and truth, and further, we were more likely to see in their just proportions our differences from those around us, when we realised how strong is the bond that unites us with them. And in the fourth place, there is the halo of true glory upon the most homely spiritual work (say of a mother with her children, whose future careers she cannot know) when it is felt to be connected with the far-off light upon the distant hills. Not that it was necessary, while convinced of all this, to fall down in idolatry before this Revised Version, or to be blind to its defects. The defects were very much what we might have expected to find them. It is one thing to produce a new translation, quite another thing to revise an existing translation. Again, it was one thing to commit the reading of different books to individual translation separately, quite another thing to set in motion the keen criticism of a large number of exact scholars over the whole surface of a volume of the New Testament. What Jerome did for the Latin Bible, however full of mistakes, was a work of genius. Not so what the Alexandrine translators did for the Greek Bible, however precious their work was for its incalculable

utility. Of the great work of Tyndale, the work of one man, the martyr of our vernacular Bible, it may be said with truth that irrespectively of his noble character it was a work of genius. Again, our honoured Authorised Version, though it was the work of many, came forth from a golden period of the English language and literature. The circumstances under which this latest revision had appeared were very different, and after the Revisers had debated and re-debated, voted and re-voted over the details of a composition which was not their own, they must not be surprised if they experienced some disappointment in the result. The conviction, however, forced itself upon his mind that it was a most serious duty with all diligence and alacrity to accept and make the most of this new gift, remembering above all that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Archdeacon Reichel, Rev. T. G. Bonney, or any of your learned correspondents would confer a favour by kindly stating the meaning of the assertion in the Fourth Commandment, that "in *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." Is that reconcileable with the evolution theory which asserts that millions of years have been occupied in making all that is in the world? Should we believe that the earth and the present species of life on it were made in six literal days, notwithstanding the assertions of scientific men? or that there were six periods or figurative days? in which case, what is to be understood by the seventh period or day? How are we to explain this to our thinking young people?

PERPLEXED.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE SOULS OF THE RIGHTEOUS; THEIR PLACE AND STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND THE GENERAL RESURRECTION." By W. R. Savage, M.A., Vicar of Awre, Gloucestershire, Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of London 1875—6. London: Chapman and Hall. 1881. Pp. xi.—248.

A proverbial saying warns us that it is of no use to dispute about tastes: and therefore when we find a clerical author recording on his title-page that he was once chaplain to the Lord Mayor of London; prefixing to his book a dedication to his Bishop as "celebrated for his sacred scholarship, revered in his episcopal capacity, beloved as a man," by "his lordship's admiring, grateful, and obedient servant"; and informing the world that "the revered chief pastor of my diocese, in a recent interview, condescended to take a kindly interest in this my humble endeavour"; we feel that it is best to wonder in silence, and to pass on to the contents of the book.

We fear that the author is over-sanguine in thinking that what he wrote originally for "an obscure village congregation" is "likely to interest the Church at large." It was but natural that "his daily ruminations on the future state" during a time of "prolonged and severe bodily affliction" should have invested the subject with paramount importance in his thoughts, and led him at last to feel as if he had a call to declare his discoveries to the Church; but when the result is examined by an impartial and critical eye, it is but too evident that he has really nothing to tell—nothing at least that can throw the faintest gleam of light on the spirit-world. His sincerity and good intention we are glad to admit; but honesty compels us to add that the book is an unhappy illustration of incompetency and ignorance. What can be the qualifications for treating such a subject of a writer who takes for granted that the innumerable Old Testament phrases about the "soul," and "going down into the pit," are to be interpreted of the disembodied spirit in the Christian sense; or who draws the doctrine of the intermediate state from the narrative of the Witch of Endor, from Isaiah's dramatic imagery of the fall of Babylon's king, and from the statement that Korah, Dathan, and Abiram went down *alive* into the pit when the earth opened beneath their feet? In what an impervious mist must the mental eye be veiled which in the Apocalyptic vision of the souls of the martyrs under the altar is impressed by what seems "but a sorry spectacle, fitted rather to excite our compassion than to raise our hopes—a confused assemblage of souls, lying prostrate beneath the altar, in an altogether unenviable, if not actually painful state"; and thinks it needful to dissipate this objection to the bliss of the departed saints by arguing that "the posture of these souls was not *recumbent*, but that of lowly *adoration*"! But to form an estimate of the book there is no need to pick out an absurdity here and there, or even to have recourse to the chapter on "The shape of the soul," which aims at showing that probably "the shape or outline of the soul is the same as that of the body which it once inhabited"; almost every page is a speaking witness of a mind untrained to think accurately, and unacquainted with the principles and results of sound Biblical interpretation.

As a specimen of exegesis we would point to the 1st, 2nd, and 8th chapters, which are discourses on the opening words of Isaiah lvii, merely premising that the point of the prophet's complaint is obviously this, that the withdrawal of the righteous by death from the ungodly nation is a sign that its doom is at hand, and yet the survivors are too careless to lay the warning to heart. On this our author founds the lesson that "whilst the death of the righteous ought always to be laid to heart, it ought never to be taken to heart—that is, ought never to furnish occasion for excessive mourning or immoderate grief": also the lesson "that this life is merely a term of probation, and that the final discrimination between the virtuous and the vicious must be looked for in another state of existence." This improvement of the text is followed by the curious suggestion that the early removal of "the youthful and pious King of Judah, Josiah, was perhaps more especially in the prophet's thoughts"; which is not easily reconciled with the well-known chronology. Equally curious is the inference from the passage of "the *moral energy* which the righteous still continue to display, even in their dis-

embodied state." One would have expected that the apparent incongruity of the metaphors, "rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness," would have sent the preacher for light to some respectable commentary; in which case he would have found that the last words describe the character *on earth* of the persons to whom the promise of future peace and rest is made.

It is difficult to know where to stop in showing how amply justified is our assertion of the writer's incompetency for his task. Here is one proof, on the quotation from the *Benedicite* of the expression, "O ye spirits and souls of the righteous, bless ye the Lord," "as showing that the conscious, active, and happy state of the righteous dead was a pious opinion several centuries before Christ." Not to insist on the fact that "several centuries" is a misleading phrase, two and a half being the most that is at all likely, there is really no ground for the assumption that it was to *departed* spirits that the invocation was originally addressed. As Mr. Fuller remarks in the new S.P.C.K. Commentary, "The 'spirits and souls of the righteous' are rightly referred, in the first instance, to the living righteous. The analogy of vv. 63, 65, seems to require this." Again, in discussing the place where the disembodied spirits dwell, our author betrays uneasiness at finding that according to the Old Testament it appears to be downwards, "in the bowels of the earth"; but according to the New, upwards, "somewhere below the skies." Consolation, however, is not wanting. Not only are *above* and *below* merely "relative terms, conveying to the Antipodeans and ourselves exactly opposite ideas"; but if after death the souls go upward, "the Lord will surely be there to receive them"; if downward, "*underneath* are the everlasting arms."

Such childish sensuousness as this is perhaps not of serious consequence; but in conclusion we must enter a protest against two more important errors. One is the denial of that progressive sanctification, that blessed growth in the image of Christ, to which enlightened Christians look forward as one of the most blessed and consoling features of the world to come. "The work of grace," it is asserted, "begun in our hearts by God the Holy Ghost and carried on progressively while we live, would seem to reach its climax at death, when we shall be wholly sanctified." The other is a canon of interpretation laid down for the purpose of vindicating the use of the parable of Dives and Lazarus as an absolutely literal description of the spirit-world. To hold that our Lord accommodated His language to the popular mode of thought is stigmatized as "savouring of blasphemy, since it exposes our Redeemer to the charge of hypocrisy at the least." One really is inclined to ask how, in any age of the world, from first to last, a revelation of spiritual verities could have been made without accommodating it to the popular mode of thought?

Mr. C. J. Plumptre on "The Music of Speech."—At the resumption of the Evening Classes at King's College, C. J. Plumptre, Esq., Lecturer on Public Reading and Speaking, delivered an Introductory Lecture entitled, "The Music of Speech." *The Daily Chronicle* gave an abstract of it as follows:—

"After a reference to the extension of the benefits of the College to ladies, Professor Plumptre observed that as his Lecture originally dealt with the rise and fall of musical notes, as expressive of human emotions, he should call it 'The Music of Speech,' which he distinguished from the music of song. It was only upon vowels that the notes of song could be placed. These, being arranged in certain notes and certain order, formed song. The notes of speech, on the other hand, were, as Professor Hullah had described them, 'concrete,' not without pause, as in song. Mr. Gladstone, in correspondence with the lecturer, had said: 'Accent, or, in other words, inflection, is not to be confounded with emphasis. It may be best defined as musical pitch, which is a matter entirely distinct from emphasis as it is from time. We really in our speeches, as indeed in ordinary conversation, run up and down the musical scale, without giving any heed to it—not, it is true, with separate and full notes of song, but with partially-formed notes, that melt or slide as it were into one another, either ascending or descending in the musical scale.' In these words the great orator had well defined the nature of speech. The influence of the eloquence of the Premier over his hearers was mainly to be attributed to his magnificent delivery and cultivated voice, more even than to his profound knowledge and the earnestness with which he pleaded the particular cause before him. Men speaking under emotion always made a difference in the length of the vowel, according to the depth of the emotion. After practically illustrating this by the delivery of a passage from 'Measure for Measure,' the lecturer proceeded to say that the real essence of language lay in the living utterance, a thought which could well be applied to the great orator to whom he had referred. The rises and falls in the musical scale were inherent to man, and every race on the earth indulged in them. Greek and Roman orators had warned their students against monotony, but it was not till the last century that speech had been reduced to a system of notation, when Joshua Steele published a work on the subject. This work, 'Prosodia Rationalis,' the lecturer exhibited to the audience, remarking that the author had taken down from the lips of Garrick and other eminent actors their chief speeches, and reduced them to a regular musical notation. Of course, though every note was there, they could not be reproduced with the same effect without the natural gifts of the orator. There was a law of antithesis in speech. The passions of love and hate, for instance, expressed themselves, the former by notes high in the musical scale, the latter low. Supplication and command were then illustrated by passages, respectively, from 'Richard II.' and Byron's 'Manfred,' the one in a high key, the other in the lowest notes. Almost every speaker spoke under a different emotion; and, in brief, opposite emotions should be spoken in opposite keys and inflections. Quoting from Darwin's work, 'Emotions of Men and Animals, as indicated by the Voice,' the lecturer said that the voice altered, not only in resonance and quality, but in pitch. This modulation became expressive in the earliest period of life, and was intimately related to vocal and instrumental music, and to muscular action. Darwin believed that utterance was first associated with courtship, in its various phases of endearment, rivalry, and triumph; and thought that the progenitors of man had the power of utterance of musical tones even before that of articulate speech. As a more practical way of illustrating his subject, Professor Plumptre then recited in magnificent style the entire third act of the play 'Henry VIII,' with which he concluded his Lecture, amidst the cheers of his audience."

SUPPLEMENT
TO
The Church of England Pulpit,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XII.—No. 306. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1881.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Will you allow me—with great deference—to endeavour to refute some of your objections to my New Testament arguments given in your last issue. True, in the Greek, the definite article has often to do duty for the indefinite—there being no other. However, *wife* is a singular substantive with a definite meaning, to which there are frequent allusions, without the use of the article, viz, Matt. xix. 3, 5, 9, 10; Luke i. 18, xiv. 26, xviii. 29; Mark x. 2; Eph. v. 33, 31; 1 Cor. vii. 2. I will not trespass on your valuable space by giving further references. In the Old Testament Scriptures there are many allusions to the plurality of wives, as being a custom existing in those times. The absence of such allusion in the New, and the repeated references to one wife, cannot be purely accidental; at least, such a supposition would be contrary to reason and analogy. Is it not rather deeply significant, there being no proof that polygamy is anywhere endorsed or acknowledged in the New Testament Scriptures. You agree in accepting Matt. xix. 5, 6, as a command, but you say a command against *divorce*. Undoubtedly it is condemnatory of divorce, but it does not therefore follow that it applies to divorce *merely*. Our Lord takes that obvious inference in order to warn His disciples more emphatically against unlawful divorce; but it is not true reasoning to confine a law to *one* of the principles that follow from it. As a command, it is also a regulation of the marriage bond. I think it will be found after careful consideration that the meaning has been narrowed to a restricted sense not laid down in the text. "Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh" (it follows as a natural *consequence* that) "What therefore God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

Further, in condemnation of divorce Christ calls it adultery; but it does not therefore follow that such is a *definition* of adultery. Logically, adultery might or might not comprise a great deal more; a certain form of sin cannot be always defined by *one* act, as, for instance, the sin of bowing "the knee to Baal" cannot be said to be a whole definition of idolatry.

I said that our Lord *condemned* the custom of putting away one wife before taking another. There is an incorrect inference gathered from my words, viz., that whosoever did *not* put away his wife before taking another in addition, committed adultery, and that therefore it would be lawful to marry another if the first was not put away? You say there was no such custom. Then what is the meaning of the words, "Whosoever shall *put away* his wife and marry another," etc.? I believe that Christ condemned both the one and the other, and that it must be admitted that adultery does not consist so much in the *putting away* of a wife as in the *marrying another*. "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband" (1 Cor. vii. 2) certainly enjoins marriage, *i.e.*, monogamy; but it cannot be said to *enforce* it, for St. Paul in the same chapter upholds *celibacy* as the holiest estate, *e.g.*, in verses 7 and 8.

To proceed with the last count. St. Paul restricts bishops and elders to one wife. It is natural to suppose that what would be unlawful for a pastor would be objectionable in his flock; but we are at liberty to assume that St. Paul meant that the former should only *marry once*, which doctrine is held in the Greek Church to this day. St. Paul says, in confirmation of this, "Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife!" to widows, "It is good for them to abide even as I."

Oct. 25, 1881. AN IRISHWOMAN.

[Our Lord was questioned only about *divorce*, not marriage in any form, and we think our correspondent is not justified in her inference that He condemned *polygamy*.]

SIR,—It is "a sign of the times," and that not a healthy one, as your correspondent "C. P. R." well remarks, that the discussion on this subject, which has been going on now for several months, should have been, for the most part, of a theoretical character, since I have not yet met with a suggestion likely to "work," if even any of those proposed were intended to be put into practice, as a substitute for the operation of the above Acts. I fear, indeed, that the tendency of these Acts is to promote callousness and social demoralisation in the face of a gigantic evil, of the extent of which I can as yet perceive no signs of alleviation or abatement.

From the spirit that has inspired your own comments on the correspondence, I can safely assume that you will agree with me in deploring as a "pity," nay, more, as a public misfortune, the fact that the publicity given through the medium of your columns, to the evil results attendant on prostitution, both to the innocent and the guilty, has not resulted in the production of an increased and systematic effort on the part of both men and women who care for the best interests of those around them, of a patriotic effort by Christians of every variety of "opinion" or creed, by some well-concerted movement, to counteract, or, at

least, alleviate, the effects of the immoral tendencies of certain classes, by means other than those contemplated in the sanitary legislation which has been under review.

With deference to your evidently honest and dispassionate treatment of the arguments from Scripture, and especially from the New Testament, which have been adduced against one partial remedy, viz., "compulsory marriage," or, rather, "polygamy" (for that necessarily results), as a "deterrent," I think you would occupy safer ground if you were to treat such concessions to human frailty as you allude to in reference to the social *status* of marriage amongst the patriarchs, as being as much concessions to the peculiar state of society then existing, as they were to a lower moral standard. From our Lord's Sermon on the Mount it will be seen, however, that that standard of morality is intended rather as a *warning*, than as a *guide*, to Christians.

The defence of such theories as one or two of your correspondents have advanced, has, however, led me to deprecate the further discussion of this subject in your columns, as I fear no good will result. However, some half-dozen of your correspondents have taken up a safer position in this matter, by their protest against the misinterpretation of Scripture, as approving or condoning what it does not, in express terms, prohibit, and against the misuse of the injunctions of St. Paul and his Divine Master, respecting divorce. A man cannot be said to "marry another" wife, after putting one away for adultery, if he has another already to fall back upon, and if adultery is to be punished in the woman, every principle of morality would render the husband liable to legal pains and penalties for the same offence. But perhaps you will give us a definition of "adultery," as, unless we employ the same terms as conveying the same meaning, it will be useless to carry on the controversy as to what is permitted and what prohibited.

I agree with most of your correspondents, that it is time something was done to enlighten public opinion as to the evil results of a dormant acquiescence in the existing state of things. But we shall inevitably revert to the antecedent state of things, which I may describe as a "dead-lock," unless the discussion takes a more practical turn. For what profit can result from the advocacy of bigamy as a punishment for seduction? Impracticable as the suggestion is, I should regard its enactment as a remedy as worse than the disease; it would have tendencies not contemplated by its advocates, in a direction opposed to, rather than promotive of, the interests of society. Surely those who would resort to such a panacea sacrifice the only moral principles on which the moral regeneration of Society can be hoped for.

I am glad, however, to find that further remedies are forthcoming, unless your correspondents hold out delusive hopes, for certainly no adequate remedy has been as yet proposed for what one of them styles, and I think he is not far wrong, the prevailing form of wickedness, if I remember right, or the crying evil of the day, which is hardly an exaggeration, although it needed the exposure of its consequences in your columns to evoke this confession.

With the spokesman on behalf of these "Acts" (in Convocation, July 20th), as I said in my previous contribution to this discussion:—"I have no faith in State action in these matters. The Government may legislate for the State, it cannot 'stem the current of human passions.'" But one of your recent correspondents suggests "the formation of a Church of England Society for striking at the root of this evil," as an agency I presume, for enlightening and influencing public opinion, by means of broad sheets scattered broad cast over the country. There are three points as to which reliable information is desirable: (1.) As to the operation of the Acts; (2.) Extent of the evils they are designed to alleviate; (3.) Suggestions as to the best practicable means of counteracting the traffic, for immoral purposes, in subjects of English and Irish extraction at home and on the Continent. On two of these points your readers have had the benefit of the experience of those well able, competent, as well as willing to inform them. The third will probably sooner or later engage the attention of our legislators. But, in the direction indicated by your correspondent, what, may I ask, can "suitable tracts and pamphlets" accomplish more than may be achieved by means of personal, *i.e.*, parental and ministerial influence and effort? "If men hear not" their elders, "neither will" suitable tracts and pamphlets "convert them." Manifold are the influences which might properly and judiciously be brought to bear upon the young, but the exercise of these influences lies with those who are responsible for their education, their parents and teachers, "spiritual pastors and masters." The indiscriminate and unstinted circulation of such leaflets, and supervision would be impracticable on a large scale, would effect harm in many cases, and I am doubtful as to the good in others, if it is sought to benefit those who have been neglected in their youth. I should be sorry to see special literature put into their hands, without the necessary safeguards. And amongst those of mature age, many would fail to discriminate between what was circulated from praiseworthy, *bonâ fide*, well-intentioned motives, and the immoral trash which—despite the efforts of law and police—finds its way into the hands of the unsuspecting, either through the post, or by means of hand to hand distribution in our streets. Besides—what seems overlooked—the Church of England is actually, by virtue of her Divine commission, as well as by reason of her constituted office as the guardian of the national welfare, the custodian of the spiritual interests and conscience of her members, a society existing for the very purpose of encouraging virtue and eradicating vice. That she has not succeeded in the latter object, is the only, or at least, the chief grounds of defence of sanitary legislation in the matter, that can be offered in justification of those of her rulers who have gone hand in hand with the State in such legislation. But any such special effort as that suggested, should, I submit, be undertaken at the instance of the whole body, not of a few isolated members scattered here, there, and everywhere.

Surely the writer must be conscious of the terrible irony which underlies his proposition? Doubtless it was unintended, yet how significant is such a comment on the views of those who had nothing better to suggest in Convocation than to give these Acts fair play; how practical a commentary on the action of those who represent the Church in her own council chamber, on their treatment of the subject, when we remember that the speakers were not responsible for the State management of our army and navy, nor, except indirectly, for the tone and character of the morality prevalent amongst our military and naval forces, that so late in the day such a proposal as the following should find insertion in the columns of your

very valuable publication :—"Let the head-quarters be in London, with branches in all our large seaport and inland towns—ah ! and even in our villages if need be. Will some one move in the work?" Who will presume to enlist as volunteers in a work which would inevitably—sooner or later—come into collision with the handicraft, the embodied wisdom of those who deem a system which may be defined as a "form of paternal government tempered by licence" suited to such an emergency? Was not the support of many of those whom we are bound to look up to with reverence, under a sense of duty, even when we cannot judge of their wisdom, given in favour of the legislation which it is the aim of true men and earnest courageous women to have reversed? Whether by a silent vote or by apologetic voices it matters not. Methinks the time is not far distant when other voices and other votes will turn the scale. At present their hands are tied, their voice inaudible. The Church at large has no commensurate voting power compared with her responsibilities. She has therefore not the power to enforce remedial measures more consonant with the spirit of her Divine Mission. Her truest workers work by other means than legislation such as that which has been under review in your correspondence columns. And her secret operations are her most effective; they will stand the ordeal when foundations raised on wood and stubble shall be consumed. Yet she might have been spared another ordeal, that of hearing from her representatives in Parliament and Convocation, the echo of the Roman Gladiators' chorus, as they marched into the arena !

All Saints' Day, 1881. CUI BONO.

[Adultery may perhaps be defined as the mixing of one man's seed with that of another, so as to obscure the parentage of, and may be to deteriorate, the subsequent offspring. Hence our Lord said that if a man, without the one lawful cause, puts away his wife and takes another, he commits adultery; and if he only put her away (unlawfully) and does not marry another, he *causeth her* to commit adultery; but if he does not put her away and marries another in addition, our Lord does not say that then he is an adulterer.—ED.]

SIR,—I do not know why it should come to be necessary to remind some of your correspondents that it is shooting quite beside the mark to argue or declaim against putting polygamy *on a par* with monogamy. The idea is a fiction of their own imagination, conjured up, it would seem, in order that they may have something they can refute.

Venturing in fear and trembling to suggest polygamy, under certain conditions, as a subject for discussion in connection with that of prostitution, I left no room to any one, I hope, to suppose that I looked upon polygamy as anything more than a possible check upon what I consider the far greater evil. But I ask whether anyone will be bold enough to allege, taking the case of which I gave a summary account in my last letter, that it was better, after the first sin, that the subsequent evils should be allowed to occur, rather than that the guilty couple, already become "one flesh," should be tied legally together, even during the lifetime of the first wife? I knew a man of wealth, under, and from under, whose "protection" many girls used to pass every year, it was said. Was it better that his lordship should have been relieved of these unfortunate ones, and the public burdened with them and the evils of the after life of most of them, rather than that they should have been tied to him, irrevocably, for his punishment and their own? Would not the very dread of this tie have restrained the debaucher immensely from the step which involved it, even if it had no such effect upon the "pure and innocent" girls, whose greed for gaiety and dress was stronger than their wish, if they had any, to preserve chastity?

My fair critic, "An Irishwoman," thinks I am in favour of a man having seven hundred wives ! I have often pitied poor Solomon. But even in the state of monogamy I have known not a few men whose married life was, to use the expression of one of them, a clergyman, too, "a hell upon earth," and there is no denying the fact, that wives have in very many cases themselves to blame for the illicit courses into which they drive their husbands. Husbands have not a monopoly of the guilt, admitting, as I do, that they have a share of it, often a large share.

Polygamy may be debilitating to mind and body. But are not the same results seen in thousands of cases from excess of indulgence, even in the monogamic state? As to "C. P. R.," I think he will find that the Scriptures do *not* place polygamy and polyandry on the same level ; nor is the former mentioned anywhere as a sin, so far as I know, whilst the latter is undoubtedly spoken of as adultery. I should hope, Sir, that the *prophecy* of your learned correspondent, "C. P. R.," in regard to your paper, confident as his utterance is, may turn out to be contradicted by events. In reference to those who become "one flesh," does not St. Paul show that this may be affirmed of any *twain* in sexual intercourse with each other, notwithstanding the dictum of "C. P. R." to the contrary?

As monogamy is, we all admit, the most perfect condition of the sexes, it is no wonder that the relevant passages of Holy Scripture should have reference to *that* condition, rather than seem to recommend polygamy as superior to, or on a level with, monogamy. Hence the expressions, "putting away a wife," not wives, every man having "his own wife," not wives ; and especially in reference to the union of the sexes as symbolical of that between Christ and His Church. No other phraseology would be fitting ; but still the same Scriptures mention the inferior condition of polygamy without in the least condemning it. As in the law of the Sabbath, and every other law, there are, confessedly, exceptions allowable, so is it, I believe, in regard to marriage. And I consider polygamy not to be an unallowed deviation from the law of marriage, but also to be not inexpedient, considering the distress brought on the nation by a flood of prostitution and attendant evils. As yet I have seen no tenable arguments on the other side.

There has been a good deal of vapouring about "progress" in this discussion. But it is very evident to many that, while there is progress in science, arts, literature, and civilization, generally, there is, in other respects, a terrible deterioration going on all the while, of which prostitution and its effects are at once the cause and the evidence. CLK.

SIR,—While it is clear that the motive which led to Onan's conduct was a dislike from some cause not expressed to raise up seed unto his brother, it is not clear that his sin was "nothing else than that of fraud." It does not follow that "the thing which he did" was not in itself sinful. When a man murders his brother, there is sin in the act as well as in the motive which

prompted it. Does "Amicus" think that such conduct between man and wife, with mutual consent, is a sin or not? That is a question which arose out of the letter of "Clergyman and Paterfamilias." "Amicus" appears to think there is no sin in such conduct. Some medical men, I believe, agree with him. I cannot but think them mistaken, for the reasons I mentioned in a former letter.

ANOTHER CLERGYMAN AND PATERFAMILIAS.

[All medical men and physiologists, we believe, are of opinion that a penalty, by injury to health, arises from Onanism.—ED.

P.S.—I cannot forbear saying that "C. P. R.'s" letter does commend itself to my mind. I cannot see how "each woman can have *her own*," that is her peculiar husband, if he belongs to another no less than to her. The "injunction to marry" which you note was to "avoid fornication," the husband should not be defrauded of conjugal rights by the wife, nor the wife by the husband, as must be the case in polygamy.

[This need not and does not occur in a *well*-regulated polygamy.—ED.]

SIR,—As your correspondent "Veritas" says, "these Acts, by the association of those whose first slip has probably been fatal in its consequences, with the hardened and oft-convicted subject, convert the former into permanent recruits of the rank and file"; and again: "The State makes no distinction in its treatment of different cases," &c., I feel it will interest your readers to know this is *simply untrue*. I know, as a fact, in the Lock Hospital I am acquainted with, viz., that at Chatham, a part of the building—a separate block from the other wards—is devoted to those who, to use the expression of your correspondent, have made their "first slip," by order of the authorities. These girls are under the care of the Head Nurse, and the Chaplain has a room appointed for his use in that block, where he sees them singly. They have their own recreation ground, into which their ward opens. Their seats in chapel are in front of the rest, so that *no* communication can take place between *them* and those who are *far gone in vice*. It is a pity more of the truth concerning the working of the Contagious Diseases Acts is not known, while the opponents can hold their meetings and spread *falsehood to their heart's content.*

AN INHABITANT OF CHATHAM.

I enclose my card. (A Lady.)

At the Chester Diocesan Conference on the 26th ult., Bishop Kelly, Archdeacon of Macclesfield, moved the following important resolution:—"That the Lord Bishop of the diocese be respectfully asked to appoint a committee to report upon the efforts that have already been made within or beyond the diocese for the prevention of the degradation of women or for the recovery of the fallen, and to suggest such measures as may seem practicable for dealing more effectually with this great and humiliating evil." He said they had only to look at the statistics given as to the number of the unhappy persons to whom the resolution referred to induce them at once to believe that the evil was appalling in its magnitude. There were, it was true, many individual and isolated efforts to deal with the evil, among others the Church Penitentiary Association, which carried on its operations most successfully in various parts of the kingdom, but such organisations were inadequate to cope with the evil. They had only accommodation for 897 persons in all. In the diocese of Chester there was no distinct organisation for the purpose, and he held that their diocesan organisations could not be considered complete until they had a diocesan home or penitentiary instituted. Mr. Christopher Bushell (Hinderton) seconded the resolution. The Duke of Westminster, in supporting the resolution, said that unquestionably an appalling state of things existed in the country. If any one present had previously had any doubt as to its being the great social question of the day—far before the question of intemperance—he must be satisfied now, after hearing the statistics which had been quoted by the mover of the resolution. But prevention was better than cure, and he urged that the suggestion of Miss Ellice Hopkins should be adopted, amending the law so as to give magistrates the power of sending children with vicious surroundings to industrial schools, and thus prevent their associating and mixing with and exerting a bad influence on children at the public elementary schools. Bishop Kelly pointed out that a clause to that effect had been added to the Reformatories Act last year. The resolution was then put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

On Wednesday week Bishop Tufnell, vicar of Croydon, laid the foundation of an immense infirmary, which is building near the workhouse at that town. It will cost £100,000, and will contain 400 beds.

The parish church of Merrow, near Guildford, was re-opened on St. Luke's Day by the Bishop of Winchester. It had for the last six months been undergoing enlargement under direction of Mr. A. Blomfield. The additions consist of a north aisle with new arches and pillars, rendering the church uniform, an organ chamber, with choir vestry, a new organ built by Hills, and an east window by Clayton and Bell, which has been inserted as a memorial of a lady lately deceased. It was Bishop Harold Browne's first visit to Merrow, and there were many assembled to welcome him; he was preceded up the church by his son, bearing the pastoral staff (presented the week before) by Archdeacon Atkinson, the Rev. H. A. Bowles, rector of Merrow, Canon Sapte, Rural Dean, Rev. W. T. Jones, and many other clergy. The Bishop preached from Haggai ii. 9. The church was decorated for the harvest thanksgiving in the evening, when the Archdeacon delivered a most earnest address on the text—"Seed time and harvest shall not cease."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baber, Rev. Harry, vicar of Ramsbury with Axford; rural dean of Marlborough (first portion).

Blunt, Ven. Archdeacon Richard Frederick Lefevre, rural dean, canon of York, and vicar of Scarborough; honorary chaplain to her Majesty.

Cordeaux, Rev. H. T., vicar of Kilnhurst; rector of Boothby Graffoe, Lincoln.

Davies, Rev. Daniel, curate of Llandyssul; perpetual curate of Llanybri.

Elliott, Rev. T. H., curate of St. Andrew's, Plymouth; incumbent of Ford, Devonport.

Green, Rev. Conrad S., formerly vicar of Helme, near Huddersfield; minister of Trinity Episcopal Chapel, Buxton.

Green, Rev. Thomas, vicar of Christ Church, Friezland, Saddleworth; honorary canon of Manchester Cathedral.

Griffith, Rev. David, perpetual curate of Llanddarog; rector of Llanllwchaiarn.

Herbert, Rev. Samuel Asher, rector of North Lew and Ashbury, Devon.

Jervis, Rev. W. H. E. R., rector of Cranford, Middlesex; domestic chaplain to Lord Fitzhardinge.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST TO THE WHOLE CHURCH AS THE BODY OF CHRIST.

By the Rev. P. G. MEDD, Rector of North Cerney; Canon of St. Alban's, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop; Oxford Bampton Lecturer and Select Preacher; late Rector of Barnes.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, Oct. 23rd, 1881.

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."—St. Matt. xvi. 18.

"And if he refuse to hear them tell it unto the Church: and if he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. Verily I say unto you, what things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them."—St. Matt. xviii. 17.

"And, behold, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age."—St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

"When therefore it was evening, on that day, the first day of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were gathered together, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had said this He shewed unto them His hands and His side. The disciples therefore were glad when they saw the Lord. Jesus therefore said to them again, Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this He breathed on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain they are retained."—St. John xx. 19.

"And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder like as of fire, and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."—Acts ii. 1.

AN organic connection binds these passages together. Considered in that connection they throw a light on some of the most fundamental principles of the Constitution of the Church as the Body of the Christ, His visible organ and instrument, by Himself appointed, nay created, to be such, for the great purposes of the carrying on of His work of Redemption and its application to individual men, through all the generations of the Christian dispensation, until He shall come again.

The first two are especially interesting because they are the earliest, and the only recorded, passages in which the Divine Founder of the great universal Society speaks of it Himself by its distinctive and familiar New Testament name, the Church, the *Ecclesia*, the aggregate of those whom the Lord should choose and call out of the world to be the believing disciples of His Son. They who owned Him as Lord were to be not a mere multitude of separate individuals, but an organised society, a kingdom, a building, of living stones indeed, but fitly framed together, a sacred building, a temple, the shrine of a Divine indwelling Presence. They were to form a Body knit together by joints and bands, and increasing with the increase of God (Col. ii.); a body growing, in the first instance, round the nucleus of the original chosen twelve, and evolving, by the force of the Divine Life which was breathed into it in the New Creation, such other distinct members and organs as should be needed for the manifestation and exercise of its own life, or for its ministration and service to others as yet outside it. The very name *Ecclesia* implies that that body was not to be co-extensive with humanity. It was to be an elect body. It was to be "not of the world," because "chosen out of the world;" yet "in the world," because it was to be, in its union with its Head, the "Light of the World," the "Salt of the Earth." In the earliest allusion to it by its more special name the Christ speaks of it as future, "I *will* build my Church." So again of its binding and loosing power, "I *will* give unto thee," He says to St. Peter, "the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Whatsoever thou shall bind or loose shall be bound or loosed." This to the Apostle whose stronger, clearer faith made him the mouthpiece and spokesman of the still rudimentary body of the believing disciples, the embryo Church of the future, which was now being made secretly and fashioned beneath, day by day, within the womb of the Jewish Church as its mother, by the creative energy of the Incarnate Word of God. This to Peter, the original germ of the strong vertebrate constitution of that body, the representative *persona*, the symbol and the organ, then and more perfectly afterwards, of an orderly executive, both for utterance and for action, both within, and on the part of, the Body.

In like language, still of the future, He speaks to the plural, the collective, the corporate Church, "What things soever *ye* shall bind or loose, shall be bound or loosed." The language is that of delegation, the great underlying principle of orderly Church authority; not necessary so long as the Master and Head was Himself bodily present on earth and operating within a limited sphere to which a locally limited presence could adequately reach; but necessary, at once, as soon as the

greatness and extent of the work transcended those narrow limits. Within the period of the Lord's earthly ministry we see this method of delegation already at work in the Mission of the Twelve, and of the Seventy, for a work in the Name and in the Power of the Christ, in places where He was not. We also see it typified in the feeding of the multitudes through the agency of the Apostles. These were foreshadowings of its fuller operation on a grander scale afterwards. The words of Christ in St. Matthew are the promise of that wider operation, and of the effectual power which should belong to it. The expressions used, *binding* and *loosing*, must be taken in both passages where they occur—(St. Matt. xvi. and xviii.)—in their general sense of deciding authoritatively either way, affirmatively or negatively, enacting or prohibiting, allowing or forbidding, admitting (if dealing with persons) or excluding; this last leading up to the forgiveness or retaining of sins, carrying with it the admission or excommunication of sinners. This exercise of the general power of the keys, though not the primary thought in the passages recorded in the first gospel, is yet there, latent and included; and is, on the later occasion recorded in St. John, expressly named and specified, with a view to the practical action which was so soon to follow upon the plenary bestowal of the great gift of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. But before we leave the passage in St. Matthew, let us note the enlargement of the number of the recipients of the promise on the occasion of its repetition as compared with its original utterance.

Progress had been made. The Body of Christ, that was to be fully born at Pentecost, had already, though still in embryo, grown and developed. The Transfiguration had further confirmed the faith of St. Peter, and of the two who, with him, were "the elect of the elect." And now, when the marked association by the Master of St. Peter with Himself, in the miracle of the stater in the fish's mouth for the Temple rate, seemed to have raised in the minds of the Apostles the question "Who among them was to be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven," the Lord—first teaching them the lesson of humility by the example of a child, and insisting that the first duty, the noblest work, of those who would be nearest to Himself was the lowly ministration to the little ones, the least and lowest, the diligent seeking after those who were gone astray and were lost; and then pointedly dwelling on the brotherly relation as the essential relation of His disciples one to another, and on the patient forbearing treatment which was due even to an offending brother—proceeds to name, as the ultimate authority, not one, not a class, but the Body itself. "Tell it unto the Church." Beyond that He names no appeal: "If he refuse to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the Publican."

Here many questions arise. What is, for this purpose, the Church? Taking it as, in the first instance, the congregation, the local body of the faithful, worshipping together in one place, to which the brethren between whom an offence has arisen both belong, and which is the local miniature representative of the great whole of which it is a part; is there, especially under the altered circumstances of a larger and more fully organised Body, no further appeal still within the Church? Or, in a still later growth, when the Church has become conterminous with the State in a Christian country, may questions arising among Christians as a religious body be carried into Civil Courts? It is no part of my present purpose to enter into these questions. My desire in commenting on these passages of Holy Scripture is to enforce the truth —as I humbly believe the important and pregnant truth, especially with reference to many controversies and difficulties of the present time—that the power and authority of Christ and the Spirit of Christ, apart from any present consideration of (what is a separate point) the provision made, and divinely made, for their due and orderly exercise and ministration by an authorised executive, are lodged in the Body itself, in its collective corporate unity, *i.e.*, as a Body. In all times of special difficulty a recourse to first principles and fundamental truths is of the highest necessity. In ordinary and peaceful times, whether in matters religious or secular, when and so long as existing machinery works easily, such questions need not, ought not to be raised. But when it is otherwise, when there is friction and heat, when long-standing machinery is out of order by mere wear and tear and lapse of time, or by altered circumstances and the application of it to purposes for which it was never intended, or, worse, by illconsidered and improvident alteration of the machinery itself, then, when the question comes, as it does come, to be this, How shall we alter, how shall we mend the existing? or, What shall we substitute for it, or add to it?—then an endeavour to obtain a clear view of principles, even as an abstract ideal, to be applied to existing circumstances as best we may, and as they will admit, becomes a duty and a necessity, unless we would labour for improvement haphazard and in the dark. This is the more necessary because it is remarkable, among the numerous writers, ancient and modern, on these passages, how few, even of those whom one would have expected to be alive to such considerations, have given due and consistent prominence to the great New Testament fact which is embedded in them.

Our Lord, then, having spoken of the Church as the ultimate authority, and first using the solemn form "Verily," with which it is His custom to introduce a statement of special importance, proceeds, still in words of prediction and of promise,

to declare the lodgment in them, in the collective plural, of plenary authority in two great departments, in teaching and discipline on the one hand, and in worship on the other. First "I say unto you, what things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

"Again, I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven."

These are the two points of the Church's Charter; and, these announced, the Founder confirms them both by the additional declaration of the great fact of supreme importance in the spiritual world wherein the Body of Christ lives and acts, and which is the ground and basis of both points: "For where two or three are gathered together in My Name there am I in the midst of them."

With additional force, and with circumstances of added solemnity, this great declaration was emphatically repeated, after the Resurrection, after the Paschal In-breathing, and towards the close, probably, of the great forty days, at the specially appointed meeting of the Lord with His disciples on the mountain in Galilee. Speaking, it may be, to "above five hundred brethren" at once, and almost certainly to more than the eleven of whom St. Matthew (quite naturally) makes especial mention; basing His words on the fulfilment of the glorious prophecy of Daniel, that to Him, as Son of Man, "All power was given in heaven and in earth," Christ gives the Baptismal Commission; and then closes this special interview with the sublime announcement to them as a Body, His Body, and, by necessary implication from the very form of the words themselves, to His Church of all time, "And, behold, I am with you all the days, until the closing of the age."

Yes, He is with His Church in its totality of all baptized believers, one with Him, through Faith and Sacraments, in and through the One Body of which He is the Head. He is with His Church as the object of her loving worship, for "He is thy Lord God, and worship thou Him," as, on the Galilæan mountain, "when they saw Him, they worshipped Him." Yet the claim of worship is not the primary purpose of this declaration of His abiding Presence. Rather its purpose is the assurance that He is with His Church as her Head, her Life, her Quickening Spirit; with His Church as her Prophet, her Priest, her King, energising her with His own Spirit, and so giving ratified effect, in the spiritual sphere of things, in heaven and in earth, to all her corporate acts, in teaching and discipline, or in worship, done in His Name, on each occasion, large or small, of her corporate and representative assembling, through that orderly and divinely-commissioned special executive ministry in its several degrees, to which the powers of the Body, at first centred in the Eleven, should, as occasion arose, be orderly entrusted by the joint operation of the Church and of the Apostles together in the Name of Christ.

We have anticipated a little; but it was necessary to connect the promise of the 18th of St. Matthew with the great words of Christ recorded in his closing verses.

There lies between an incident of cardinal importance, the Sacramental Inbreathing, with most expressive outward sign, on the Paschal night, upon the company assembled "with doors shut for fear of the Jews." Who were they to whom He then said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost"? Whom did He thus quicken from Himself with the life He had newly won for them? Whom did He make His standing representatives on earth by the great words of the all-inclusive Apostolic commission, "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you"? The Father had sent Him, the great "Apostle and High Priest of our profession," with an abiding commission for a prolonged work. That commission, that work, were, necessarily, to go on, as solely His commission, His work. Only the method of its exhibition was to be changed. His visible, local, limited operation was to be exchanged for His, still His, invisible, unlimited, spiritual operation through a visible agency by which He should continuously work, with even more marvellous results than before: "Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go to the Father." With whom, when the earthly mode of His Presence was over, did the Christ lodge this delegated authority to be His organ, His instrument? We answer, With His Church at large; with "the Church which is His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." With His Church as a Body, not with the Apostles only, though this is very generally overlooked. This oversight is the more strange because that the narratives of the evening meeting of the Lord with the disciples, in the 24th of St. Luke and the 20th of St. John both refer to the same incident is generally allowed. For both evidently refer to the first occasion of our Lord's manifestation of Himself, on the Paschal night, to His assembled disciples in the Holy City. A close comparison of the passages would seem to make their reference to different evenings, or to different periods of the same evening, quite impossible. The whole point of either narrative is gone if it is not, in each case, the narrative of the first meeting. Certainly the assumption of a break of time between verses 20 and 21 of the 20th of St. John is gratuitous. Nothing could be more life-like and natural than that, after the agitation, joyful as it was, of such a revelation, the Lord, being about to do so solemn a thing, should repeat His calming salutation of peace. And verses 24, 25, compared with 20, render it very probable that Thomas, if he is to be included in "the Eleven" of St. Luke, left them before the manifestation of Jesus, or

joined them after it was over, and, hearing of the proofs of His identity which had been vouchsafed to the rest, refused to be satisfied unless the same were vouchsafed to himself. It is more probable, however, that St. Luke uses the phrase "the Eleven" in the corporate sense, for the *collegium*, though only Ten were actually present.

But the important point is that St. Luke distinctly includes others. His phrase is "The eleven and them that were with them." We know that there were at the time in Jerusalem disciples of our Lord, men and women, who had followed Him from Galilee, and others belonging to Judea and Jerusalem, of whom Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa were examples. We know that the assembly which elected to the vacancy of the traitor Judas, some forty days later, numbered one hundred and twenty names. It would seem beforehand most unlikely that, in that hour of uncertainty and fear, the Apostles alone would meet, to the exclusion of all their brethren and sisters, sharers in the same faith, partners in the same grief, exposed to a common danger, the marked objects of the same contempt and hatred. Whatever meeting was held at that supreme crisis must have included all the group that had stood by the Cross faithful to the last. We can hardly suppose that St. John would, so soon, and on such an occasion, have separated himself from the Mother of Jesus, or that all, Apostles or not, would not have eagerly secured the attendance of "the honourable counseller" and the "Master in Israel." St. John's general term, "the disciples," may well cover all these and more. St. Luke's more precise phrase, "the Eleven and them that were with them," assures us that it does so; and they, whosoever and how many soever they were, were certainly joined by the two from Emmaus, Cleopas, and, as some think, St. Luke himself. It is evident also that these two last knew where to find the eleven and them that were with them. There was some recognised meeting-place. This may possibly, perhaps even probably, have been "the" (not "an") "upper room" of Acts i. 13, which may have been "the large upper room furnished," the scene of the last supper; and this, again, may have been in the house of Mary, the Mother of John, whose surname was Mark, and the sister of Joses and Barnabas, whom St. Luke's account in the Acts represents to have been in a position to have owned a house in the city with a room capable of holding a hundred and twenty persons. The locality, however, is unimportant. What is important is the really indisputable fact that this gathering was an inclusive and representative gathering; was, in effect, the Church of the moment in its entirety, the society with its officers and leaders, the body with its organs. Then took place the vitalizing contact between the Risen Head and the members, whereby they were constituted His living body, His visible representative, His very self, upon earth, by the sacramental in-breathing of His own divine life, only now become communicable since the atoning death and the resurrection. (See John vii. 39.) Then, once more, by a new creation, the Lord God re-formed man. Then the eternal Word, now incarnate, once more, and in a higher sense, "breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." (Genesis ii. 7.)

To use a natural and physiological illustration, which Holy Scripture, by its frequent comparison of the phenomena of the spiritual life to those of the natural life, and especially by its frequent employment of metaphor of the body and its members to illustrate the life of the Church, seems to warrant, one might say that, as Pentecost was the undoubted birthday of the Church, when she came forth into visible public existence in the world, and began to speak and act, so this earlier occasion on the Paschal night was the quickening into life of those embryo materials of the great spiritual body which, begotten by the Son of God, had, during His public preparatory ministry, been slowly forming within the womb of the Jewish Church.

We shall now the better understand the action of the Body in repairing the loss to its organs resulting from the treason of Judas. It is, like everything else in the Book of the Acts, a typical and illustrative case, embodying and defining a principle of standing obligation under like circumstances, *mutatis mutandis*. The action is now, on the face of it, that of the Body. Returning from the ascension to Jerusalem "with great joy," as the same St. Luke tells us, yet, doubtless, awfully impressed with the grandeur of their corporate commission and of its responsibility, while filled, at the same time, with a stirring sense of living energy in the power of Christ's resurrection and abiding presence with them, the Eleven and the rest, "with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and His brethren," continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, not in the temple only, but also in their special meeting-place, "the upper room," the earliest Christian Church. Here, under the guidance of its chief officer, St. Peter, did the infant society perform its first corporate act, appealing in all solemnity to the promised ratification by the Head; and Matthias was "numbered with the eleven Apostles." The Body was once more complete. But it were inexplicable that it should thus have acted, especially in a matter of such cardinal importance, had it not previously received, as a body, the empowering commission to do so in the words, "As the Father hath sent Me even so send I you." The Church is "sent" by Christ to exhibit and to execute His own apostleship, including, in due order, in the spiritual sphere, His governing, His teaching, and His sacerdotal functions. Our Prayer Book expressly admits this principle, in the wording of the special absolution, "Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power to His

Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him." But, for such exhibition and execution in act, the power and authority and responsibility which are lodged and vested in the body, must be orderly exercised by duly appointed organs. For this primary object the Church, at the first and always acting with her Head through her existing organs, whom the Head Himself at the beginning directly and immediately chose and named and appointed, appoints, as occasion arises, in continuing succession, her executive organs and officers. They thenceforward being so appointed, and only when so appointed, act in His name at once and in hers, by His commission at once and by hers, as His representatives at once and as hers, because of the common life which is His and hers, His in her, for His regenerating work in the world of man.

On the Body so completed, and not on the twelve alone, descended the full Pentecostal effusion; though the break between the first and second chapters of the Acts tends to hinder the perception of this to the ordinary reader. What we have already learned, as to the two collective meetings, at the beginning and end of the great forty days, and that on the mountain in Galilee in the interval between, furnishes of itself a strong presumption that it would be so on the crowning occasion of Pentecost. A close study of the Greek in Acts i. 13, 14, 15, and ii. 1 points to the same conclusion. There is the same emphatic statement, in almost the same words, of the assembling of all, with one accord, in one and the same place, in the account of the Pentecostal meeting as there is in that of the Post-Ascension meeting. It is certainly more natural to understand the emphatic "all" of the first verse of the second chapter, of the larger number, the hundred and twenty at least, whose constituent elements, so representative in character, had been specially enumerated a few verses before, than to restrict it to the twelve Apostles only.

Again. If the Church as a whole, the original body of the first believers, did not receive the Holy Spirit on the Easter-night and at Pentecost, but the Apostles only, when did they receive it? Though baptised doubtless, with the preliminary baptism of John "unto repentance," it does not appear that they ever received Christian baptism, as did the three thousand who were added, not to the Apostles, but to the Church, after St. Peter's sermon. There is absolutely no indication of the exclusive bestowal of the gift on the Apostles only and its subsequent bestowal by, through, or from them on the rest of the first believers; but, on the contrary, every indication of their having received it at one and the same time. The idea of such a distinction would probably not have occurred to the first or second generation of believers It is altogether a later growth, natural indeed, because the gift originally bestowed on the body was, as the Church grew, bestowed on new converts, through baptism and confirmation, by the authorised officers of the body, that is by the body, or, more exactly, by the Head and the Body acting as one indivisible unity, through the organs of the body.

A yet further argument, and one (it would seem) of some force, may be drawn from the consideration that there would have been somewhat of inappropriateness, to say the least, in St. Peter's quotation of the prophecy by Joel of the great distinctive blessing of the New Covenant as then and there, incipiently, fulfilled, if a passage which promises an outpouring "upon all flesh" . . . "sons and daughters" . . . "young men and old men" . . . "servants and handmaidens," had been realised only in the persons of the twelve. What assurance would a gift limited to the officers of the Church have given to others, as yet outsiders, that they also, upon repentance and baptism, might receive "the gift of the Holy Ghost?" Or what meaning, upon the narrower exposition, can one attach to the words, "For the Promise" —*i.e.*, the Promised gift (compare the Greek of Acts ii. 39 with that of i. 4, and the "Tu rite Promissum Patris" of the *Veni Creator*)—"is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call"?

Moreover, it is to be noticed, whatever it may be worth, that the languages miraculously spoken were certainly more than twelve in number. We must suppose, surely, that what actually took place was not an unmeaning display of miraculous powers in unintelligible speech, but that various groups, of various languages, among the multitudes who thronged the Holy City and the Temple at a great Festival, found themselves severally addressed "in their own tongues wherein they were born," by one or more of these Galilæan Christians who spoke to them "the wonderful works of God" in the Death and Resurrection and Ascension of the Christ, which stupendous facts, with the talk about which the whole city would be ringing, were attested by the miracle before them.

And, lastly, to mention another point in the same line with our present argument; after the first touch of persecution, when Peter and John had been "put in hold" for a night, and brought up next morning before the Sanhedrim, we read (Acts iv.) that "being let go they went to their own company, and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them," and that they, when they heard that, "lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and prayed" that prayer to which was vouchsafed an almost second Pentecost, so that "the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the Word of God with boldness. And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul." This again does not read as if the company assembled were only the remaining Ten Apostles.

We conclude then that the great endowments

of the Lord's abiding presence and the indwelling life of His inbreathed Spirit were bestowed, not on the Apostles only, not on the Apostles first, and through them on the body, but at once on the whole Church as a Body, and on the Apostles in and with, and as part, albeit the most highly organised and vital part, of the Body mystical of the Christ.

This fact, once clearly grasped, becomes a leading and fundamental principle, ruling our whole consequent conception of the constitution of the Church, of the nature and position of the ordained ministry, of the mutual relation of clergy and laity, and of the solemn responsibility for his due share in the general work of the whole which the Common Commission lays upon each several member of the Body, in his measure and place, "in his vocation and ministry," to which he is called of God. The effects of the general forgetfulness of this controlling truth, in the weakening of Church life, and the hindering of Church work, in the present day, are only too apparent. But the application in detail of this great overruling thought must be left to another opportunity.

HARVEST THANKSGIVING.

By the Rev. F. TILNEY BASSETT, M.A.,
Vicar of Dulverton, Somerset.

Sermon Preached at St. Matthew's, Bath, on Tuesday, Oct. 11th, 1881.

"It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory."—1 Cor. xv. 43.

THE fulfilment of any promise which God has given us should be always an occasion of joy and thankfulness, not only because of the special benefit conferred, but also because it is a proof of God's faithfulness, and so an earnest that He will perform all other promises which as yet wait their accomplishment in the future. When things are thus viewed, we live as it were, in the Great Church of the Universe, and all the doings and dealings of God with us become signs and sacraments of greater things to come, the earthly is translated into the region of the heavenly. Each year as the harvest clothes our fields with the robes of plenty we behold the broad seal of heaven stamped upon the earth, testifying that God is true to the ancient promise pronounced when the deluge of waters was dried up and Noah and his family came forth from the ark: "While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest shall not cease." And thus, acccording to our rule, the harvest itself is sublimated and raised to a higher sphere, and becomes both a type and a prophecy of a greater ingathering to come, when the field shall be the world, the reapers the angels, and the good corn the gathered and garnered saints. In like manner, and in connection with the same promise, each time we gaze upon the bow painted on the skirts of the thunderstorm we see the finger of God registering His truth and renewing the promise of preservation to mankind, and then having fulfilled this office, the bow is lifted up from the scene of her earthly testimony into the region of the heavenly, and melts away from the train of the cloud only to regather her colours and weave them into a belt around the throne of God, that the saved may ever have before them the symbol of the Divine faithfulness and a guarantee of their own everlasting security. Thus Nature and Grace are twined and welded together, mutually supporting and mutually interpreting each other, and are not antagonistic, as some would tell us; and if we would read the parable aright the four seasons become to us four Evangelists, each with its own special gospel of peace. In winter we are told of our fall and our death, our needs and our sufferings; but in the midst of the drear and desolate scene, the Branch from on high visits us, coming down to banish death and "bring life and immortality to light." This is the Gospel of the Incarnation! In spring, with its verdure bursting from the tomb, and its silver bloom covering field and forest, we hail the Gospel of the Resurrection and life from the dead. In summer, with its swelling fruits and ripening plains, we recognise the work of the Spirit in perfecting the people of God. This is the Gospel of preparation for the kingdom. And in autumn, the golden fields waved as a wave-offering before God, and the mellow fruits, fit pictures of the perfected saints, proclaim the Gospel of the glory.

I. (1.) There are two distinct parables or comparisons in Scripture based upon the seed that is sown: the one is the first and most familiar of our Lord's parable, the sower sows the seed, which the Divine Author Himself tells us is the Word of God, and it falls on different soils, which represent different kinds or conditions of heart; whereas in the other comparison, which is that of our text, the seed is the body of the believer, which was a temple of the Holy Spirit, the sowing the consignment to the grave, and its springing up, its resurrection. Let us glance at the first of these lessons. Take that grain of seed-corn in your hand, look at it. It is small, dry, dead seemingly; but see, there is a minute mark upon it; it is the germ, the source and signature of life, the evidence of the potentiality of a resurrection. Such seeds are cast by the sower into different soils; some find a place on the wayside, others on rocky ground, others among thorns, and others on good land. These last gather to themselves juices from the soil, and the rain, and the air, and the sun, and burst and bud and blossom, and put forth the ear that ripens into golden grain and is gathered into the garner, rendering some thirty-fold, some sixty, and some an hundred. We are too much in the habit when dealing with this parable to be content to separate the seed and its history into two distinct classes,

the failing and the fruitful, and then cease from after investigation in the case of the latter. There is a great difference between the yield of thirty and an hundred-fold; whence this difference? The seed before coming to maturity has not only various stages of growth, but various trials also to pass through; some seeds, although they have not fallen on the wayside, yet are in perilous proximity to the hard-trodden path, and their growth and development are in no small degree affected thereby; and others, though they do not find their bed among the dense and overwhelming growth of thistles and thorns, yet have constant conflict with entangling weeds; and others, though not on soil that is underlaid by rock immediately beneath the surface, yet find many an obstructive stone, round which the tender stem must bend and turn before it can enjoy the full nourishment of shower and sunshine. Then there are the vicissitudes of weather to be considered, as well as the local difficulties of the seed-plots, though these are of a general influence rather than a partial. The rain is withheld, it may be, when the seed is first sown, and germination is hindered at its proper time; when the sprout is just above ground, a biting frost chills its early life; then comes a swamping rain that threatens rottenness to the root; or a burning, blistering sun bears down on the fields, and the rising plant shrivels and pines; or again, when the ear is filling and becoming weighty with its wealth, a hurricane sweeps over hill and valley, and the straw is broken and the ear lies hopeless on the ground, so that some that might have borne a hundredfold yield but sixty, and the sixty, thirty, and the thirty, none. Yet it must be remembered that all these apparently hostile accidents are overruled for the universal good, and indeed, strange as it may sound, are necessary for the one great end in view, the perfection of those that shall endure to the end. The frost keeps back the too exuberant growth, the floods provide a store of sap against the drought that follows, and the sun infuses life-power and constitution into the crop; and though the hurricane may break down some that gave promise, yet it imparts to those that endure more root-hold in the soil, so that after all the changes and chances of the growing-time, its lights and shadows, its hopes and fears, all things, as we have specially seen in the season through which we have just passed, work together for good, and for this we are assembled to praise and thank our God who commanded the clouds above both to give and restrain their showers, who made His sun to shine, and our hills and our valleys to laugh and sing.

(2.) We turn to the interpretation of the figure; such is the history of the earthly seed; let us now study the spiritual seed and its history.

My dear brethren, I appeal to many a soul before me. Have you not been a listener in this house of God, or been in conversation with some Christian friend, or reading some religious book, and a small text, a single word, it may be, has fallen on your ear or eye, and so passed inwardly to your heart, where perhaps it has found a hard bed, and Satan has been on the watch and conveyed away the treasure; or it fell on rocky ground, and you put forth a precocious rapid growth, and made a great profession, you rejoiced in the glad tidings, declared yourself a Christian, and began many a good course; but suddenly you flagged, the means of grace were forsaken, your conversation degenerated into carelessness and worldliness, your faith failed, your love grew cold, the straw was withered, the ear empty, and no fruit is found by the Reaper. Or it fell on the thorny tangle; the cares of this present time's biting tooth consumed your thougths, and temporal trials overburdened you, and you forgot where your strength alone could be found; or pleasures spun their soft silken nets around you, and fortune smiled a seductive smile, and success in the world and gratified ambitions deluded you to think that this wilderness was your rest, and Canaan, the land beyond, was forgotten, and you were entered in the great ledger of heaven as unfruitful.

And, my dear brethren, do not the thoughts which we ventured to read between the lines that told of the difference in the amount of produce apply to your spiritual history? It is true, thanks be to God, that in your case the seed fell on honest and good hearts, prepared and made so by the preventing grace of the Spirit, who ploughed up your fallow ground, and harrowed out of it many hindrances and stumbling blocks; yet you, my believing, quickened brethren, have been trained in trial, and that salutary education is still proceeding; the scene of vicissitude which has witnessed the failure of others has been a school in which you have learnt both your weakness and your strength. We spoke of some seed falling in dangerous proximity to the way side, and how much of the hard old-Adam heart still remains to be broken up? Do you not know what it is for weeds to spring forth, and twine around the plant of grace? Have you felt no thorns of passion and unseemly lust besetting your soul—no rank growths of the world and the flesh rising up side by side with the good seed? Oh yes, you have had your battle with principalities and powers of darkness. What Gethsemane prayers have you uttered before the throne of grace that this cup might pass from you, that this stake in the flesh might be extracted! Oft times you have found that the deepness of earth was not sufficient, and oh! had it not been for showers of grace—plenteous showers—where would be your fruit? And when the scorching sun, like the furnace of Babylon seven times hotter than his wont, kindled his fires upon you, if the Angel of the Lord had not come down and beaten back the flames and made a chamber of dew in the midst of the conflagration, you would have been parched and withered and

worthless. And when the hurricane of disaster, whatever was the cause that excited the whirlwind, whether temptations from the flesh on the fierce assaults of Satan, swept over your soul, if the Lord whose footfall once bent straight the curved waves, and whose voice commanded the blast and the billow "Peace, be still," had not lifted up His standard against the foe and stilled the storm, the broken straw and the blighted grain would have told the tale of your spiritual death and eternal loss. But, praised be God, you remain a monument of His faith, fulness and grace; He who prepared the soil and sowed the seed of eternal life in your heart, He who led you to the cross of the Lord Jesus and washed all your sins away in the fountain opened there, has never ceased to watch over you; the dew and rain of His Spirit still fall on you, when need requires and your cry ascends, the sunshine of love and favour gladdens you, and even adverse assaults are overruled, if not wholly averted, and so you are growing in grace and in assured hope of the Great Harvest day, when the Sower shall rejoice as He gathers in the sheaves, the travail of His soul, and as He presents them before His Father, "Lo I and the children whom Thou hast given me!" The heavens above and the earth beneath will ring and re-echo with the song of the harvest of the saints; "Salvation to Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb for ever and ever."

II. The second comparison, based upon the seed sown, now demands our attention. It is that contained in our text. The seed here is the corpse of the believer sown in the grave, and raised again in the harvest of the resurrection. It is a bare naked seed again. "We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out." How often have we watched such a seed preparing for its sowing, the decline and waste of flesh and sinew, the failing frame, the glazing eye, the fluttering though silent heart, the last cord snapped, the golden bowl broken, and then, oh! sorrow of sorrows, we have hidden the once loved form, now corrupting and loathsome, from our sight, and buried it down deep in mother earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust. We have thus watched over, and thus ministered the last offices to our treasured ones, and they in like manner will deal and dispose with us. But, look at the seed and its parable. In that wasting form, in that corrupting mass, there is a germ, as in the grain; it is the life of God! God called that one by His grace, led him to the cross for pardon and peace, sanctified and sealed him with the Holy Spirit who made that body his temple, and that soul his dwelling-place. Now look at the teaching contained in Rom. viii. 11, "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." That body, cast into the earth like seed, shall rise again. The hour is hastening, the fields are ripening for the harvest, the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with the word of command, with the voice of the archangel and the trumpet blast of God, and the dead in Christ shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall start from their beds and stand up a glorious host, a golden harvest. From churchyards in our quiet hamlets, from crowded cemeteries, from thick-packed burial grounds within old city walls, from battle-fields and waste deserts, where the bones have blanched in the heat by day, in the cold by night, from plague pits where masses of festering humanity have been piled heaps upon heaps in one common charnel house, and the sea shall roll back her waves and give up her dead—oh, what an ingathering of the fruits of God's acres and domain that will be, when the great multitude which no man can number, shall be reaped from every nation, and kindred, and tribe, and tongue, and the blood-bought and sanctified sons of God shall be folded within the golden gates and be stored in the garner of God for ever: then shall the harvest hymn be sung, "All the fruits are gathered in:" "It was sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory."

(2.) One word upon the constitution and condition of the future body. The baffled inquirer is represented in this chapter as putting this question for solution, "With what body do they come?" and the inspired answer takes the form of a parable, and that parable the comparison of the bare single grain with the full and fruitful ear. And in the carrying out of his interpretation the Apostle says that the body, that is consigned to the tomb, is sown a *natural* body, and it is raised a *spiritual* body. I suppose that most persons, when reading this, understand by the *natural* body, one that is material, visible, palpable; and by the *spiritual* body one that is immaterial, invisible, ghostly; but such is not the meaning of these terms of definition. The natural body is that which is governed by the soul, its feelings, instincts, and passions, an animal body; whereas the spiritual body is that which is governed by the spirit, the sanctified reason, the logic of heaven; there is nothing in either of the words that refers to matter; the future body, for aught we know, will be as material as the present one, though differently conditioned, "I believe in the resurrection of the flesh."

Further, as to the condition of the resurrection body, our text tells us, "It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory." "It is sown in dishonour" or in "disgrace;" death is the penalty of sin, and though the Lord Jesus has plucked the victory from the grasp of death, yet it remains the last enemy, the last taint of the fall, the last legacy of the old Adam, the last sting of the old serpent; hence all go to one place, "the body is sown in dishonour," "but it is raised in glory." Now *glory* in Holy Scripture is only employed in a secondary

sense, to mean what we generally understand by it, *moral excellence.* Its primary use is to designate God's visible majesty; glory is the symbol of His presence, the sign of His manifestation; perhaps our present use of the word *magnificence* would best represent the idea. Look now at the seed once more; it is a bare dry seed, but when cast into the ground it accretes and assimilates to itself nourishment, bulk, development, and beauty from the elements—the earth, the air, the rain and the sun, combine their powers to invest the seed with robes of loveliness; "God giveth it a body." In like manner the body, by the mysterious ordinance of God, is to gather to itself clothing and beauty at the resurrection day; four times in this chapter we are told that it will *put on, clothe itself with* the conditions of eternity. This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality; and in the 5th chapter of the second epistle, an even stronger word is used, "to be clothed over and above upon." And what is the clothing? It is called "a house not made with hands," "a house from heaven;" its origin is from above, though it becomes accreted to and associated with the body born of earth. Again, what is the direct teaching of Scripture on this subject? In His self-dedication prayer our Lord prayed to His Father on behalf of His people, and said, "The glory which Thou gavest Me, have I given them;" and the Apostle declares "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." Thus, to examine this grand and elevating question more closely: when Christ took upon Himself our nature, "the Word was made flesh, and pitched His tabernacle in us, and we gazed upon His glory, as being that of the only begotten of the Father," the glory of God was incarnate in Jesus Christ. At the Transfiguration this glory burst through the precincts of the human flesh of our Lord like the fire in the midst of the pillar of cloud, and it folded up in its embrace Moses and Elijah, types of the Church in the heavenly state. Further, the Lord's promise is that He will come again in His glory, to take His people to Himself, and thus saith St. Paul: "He will change the body of our humiliation that it may be transfigured to the body of His glory;" hence it appears that the Saviour took upon Him our flesh when He came on earth, and we are to assume His glory, when He takes us to heaven. Surely these are "great and precious promises, whereby we become partakers of the divine nature." Yes, this body which the Lord redeemed with His most precious blood, in which the Spirit has dwelt, which has been sanctified for the Master's use, is passing through a ripening process, for sanctification is glory begun, and glory is sanctification perfected; and when the resurrection morn shall dawn, then shall the glory of God clothe and crown His people, as the golden ears are the vestment of the once poor beggarly seed that was cast into the ground. What an incentive for self-examination, for progress, for growth in grace, for energy and zeal in spreading the Gospel of salvation in our parishes and missions? What a winding up of God's purposes? What a conclusion to the roll of Revelation? What a volume of consolation to those who have dear sainted ones gone before? What a treasure of hope that cannot fail to us who are running the race that is set before us, or are passing even now inside the gates of death! "It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory."

III. Let us take home with us a personal lesson. If a few weeks ago you had gone into a field of standing corn, you would have seen stalks standing up strong and stalwart, with ears filling with food and preparing for the garner, and, in between those plants of promise, others with broken straw, bending, bowed upon the ground; you might have felt the ear, and would have found it empty, shrivelled, dead; the one was ripening to perfection, the other rotting to perdition. The ears of corn are a parable of our state. Are we, brethren, ripening or rotting? Each day we progress nearer to the golden sheaf in the garner, or to the bundles and the burning: which is it? Is the thirtyfold of last year become sixtyfold this year, to expand into a hundredfold in the year to come? Is the Spirit's work deepening in us day by day? Is our march steadily onward and upward from glory to glory? If so, our bodies may be sown in dishonour, but "the souls of the rightous are in the hand of God, and there shall no evil touch them; in the sight of the unwise they seem to die, and their departure is taken for misery; but in the time of visitation, they shall shine and run about like sparks amongst the stubble;" and when the Lord of the harvest shall return to gather in His fruits, these bodies shall rise again in the magnificence of unfading glory, and the seed corn of earth shall be transfigured into the Harvest store of heaven. "It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory."

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1881.

INASMUCH as we have from time to time chronicled the movements and speeches of the Old Catholics on the Continent, we rejoice that two of their Bishops have been cordially received by Churchmen at Cambridge and Lincoln, as well as by the Archbishop of Canterbury and many of our Bishops. The Old Catholics have more to gain from adopting our Church

polity than we have from intercommunion with their Churches. We are sure that all Protestants, whether High, Low, or Broad Churchmen, will wish them god-speed in their aspirations for light and freedom, and in their efforts to emancipate themselves from the tyranny and superstition of the Roman Church. It is no part of our creed to draw a hard and fast line between things temporal and things eternal, or practically to believe that the death of the body causes a breach of continuity in the life of the soul. We know that our Lord designed to save the bodies as well as the souls of men, and that if we are really baptized into His character, our secular not less than our sacred actions will be done as in His sight, and will be equally estimated by Him. We believe that the actions of the State, no less than those of individuals, should be in accord with His teaching and sanctified by His Spirit. For these reasons we strongly deprecate any further separation between Church and State. Bishop Reinkens may from his experience elsewhere denounce the alliance as "a monstrosity," and vow that his Church will have "nothing to do with State-Catholicism." If he knew more of our Church system perhaps he would agree with Dr. Dollinger that England would lose more than she would gain by disestablishing her Church, which the venerable divine justly regards as "a great bulwark of religion throughout the world."

CHURCH CONGRESS.

"The Claims of the Revised Version of the New Testament to General Acceptance."

By the Rev. T. S. EVANS, M.A., Canon of Durham, and Professor of Greek in the University of Durham.

The Canon spoke as follows :—"The merits of the Revised Version have been, though not without some difference of opinion, widely and amply appreciated. It is therefore unnecessary for me to expatiate upon the good service rendered by the Revisers. And if I venture to submit to your consideration certain passages, the new translation of which I for one cannot admire, it must not be supposed that I desire to find fault, but rather to contribute what little I can to the cause of truth. Beyond question, in the Revised Version texts have been altered which should have been allowed to stand, and texts have been allowed to stand which might have been improved. The passages which I have time to lay before you are few, but these few, unless I am much mistaken, are representatives of a constituency—members of a family somewhat numerous, say a family of a hundred brethren. 'I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven.' On this text let me tell you a secret: the Greek participle translated by fall when it came under the critical eye of the Revisers erected its dorsal sin of an accent and cried in lamentable tones, 'Do render me fall,' as before: but they, the Revisers, unheeding the voice, did without any pity change 'fall' into 'fallen,' rendering the whole verse, 'I behold Satan fallen as lightning from heaven.' Is *fallen* right grammatically? I for one think not. Is 'fallen' right logically? Judge ye. There is a simile here: a comparison between Satan and lightning. In a comparison there is always a congruity between the thing compared and that to which it is compared. What we may predicate of the one we may predicate the other. If it is correct to say, 'I saw Satan fall like lightning,' it must also be correct to say, 'I saw lightning fall.' By parity of reasoning, if it is correct to say, 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning,' it must also be correct to say, 'I saw lightning fallen.' But we cannot see lightning fallen: we can see it fall, shoot, dart from point to point, from sky to earth, but fallen we cannot behold it: when it has fallen we can only see its effects in a blasted oak or a calcined ox. 'But ye were washed, ye were sanctified, ye were justified' (1 Cor. vi. 11). The marginal rendering for 'ye were washed' is 'ye washed yourselves.' Is the new rendering 'ye washed yourselves' right grammatically? I for one think not. Why so? Because if the simple verb *elousasthe* may signify 'ye washed yourselves,' which I venture to question, surely the compound verb *apelousasthe* should have been rendered 'ye washed yourselves away.' And this would have been a much better translation, especially if after the word 'away' had been appended in italics 'from your sins.' But even that rendering would be incorrect, because the force of the middle voice positively requires that the translation be not 'Ye washed yourselves away from your sins,' but 'Ye washed away your sins—from yourselves.' That this is the right translation appears to me quite certain from a parallel passage in the Acts—'Arise, baptize, wash away thy sins:' where is the same verb, the same voice, the same tense. The next is an important text, Rom. v. 2. 'Through whom we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand:' 'we have'—old version: 'we have had'—new version. Is the new reading right grammatically? I, for one, think not. Is it right logically? Consider. 'We have had' seems to imply 'We have no more:' certainly, what 'we have no more,' that we have had. But methinks I hear the voice of revision say, 'the Greek verb is in the perfect tense, and, therefore, must be rendered we have had.' Beyond question the Greek verb is in the perfect tense, but need not, therefore, be rendered 'we have had.' Are there not two perfects to *echo*? There are; one signifying 'we had had,' the other 'we have got' or 'obtained.' It is this last form of the perfect that is used by St. Paul in this text, and with good reason, for grammar and logic will harmonise and sing a joyous duet together, if we render 'through whom we have by faith obtained our access into this grace wherein we stand.' Here are two causes of access: one objective, Christ: the other subjective, faith: Christ the door, faith the hand that moves the door to open and to admit. 'Gather up the fragments that remain;' fragment deleted, substituted 'broken pieces.' Is 'broken pieces' right grammatically? I for one think not. Is 'broken pieces' right logically? Judge ye. If I break a jar in ten pieces, each piece lies on the ground unbroken, sound, entire; but if I stamp upon one and break it, it then becomes a broken piece. Moreover, if the Greek noun *clasma* may be rendered 'a piece broken;' then *thelema*, or 'will,' may be rendered 'a thing willed,' and *rhapisma*, or 'slap on the cheek,' may be rendered 'the thing slapped,' or 'a cheek;' and *trupema*, or 'eye of a needle,' may be rendered 'the thing bored,' or 'a needle.' And it will

be grammatically correct to say, 'It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle.' 'It is not meet to take the children's loaf and to cast it to dogs. Yea, Lord; for the dogs eat of the crumbs, &c.' In this text the woman's reply is not cleverly corrective, but reverentially confirmative of our Lord's statement. A disturbing element is imported by the 'even' of the translation of the Revised Version, 'for even the dogs.' The instances that I have given, and others that I have not given, appear to me to justify the conclusion that the Revised Version, before it can be considered a faithful mirror of the true original text, or receive the imprimatur of authority, must be submitted to a close and careful scrutiny. About the English diction I have said nothing, time forbidding; but it will be apparent to all that language may be faithful to the original, and yet not suitable for public reading in churches, either because of unrhythmical cadence, or from occasional verbosity, enlarging a single text into a short sermon (for instance, 'Blessed is he whosoever finds none occasion of stumbling in me'), or from the multiplication of little words for the sake of accuracy at the cost of robustness; for instance, 'He it is who shall save us from our sins.'"

The Rev. J. F. Bateman said he wished to say one or two words from the standpoint of a country clergyman, who once, at college, knew a little Latin and a little Greek, but who since then had forgotten much of the former and more of the latter. While doing this, however, he had, he hoped, obtained a little more knowledge of his dear old native tongue, and of the way in which it might best be "understanded of the people." It would be most unseemly for him to offer any criticism on the Greek views of those able men who had furnished the revision; but with respect to some of their English he claimed the right to demur. He thought our people would not like to lose the grand old word "charity," and he could not believe they would ever replace it in certain circumstances by the word "love." As an instance, they might take a passage from Peter, which read—"Adding, on your part, all diligence; in your faith supply virtue, and in your virtue knowledge; and in your knowledge temperance, and in your temperance patience; and in your patience godliness; and in your godliness love of the brethren; and in your love of the brethren love." This to his mind was not nearly so beautiful as the passage with which all had familiarised themselves—"Add to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity." But without going into further illustrations of this description, he thought they should all thank God that this Revised Version should have appeared at the present time. It had drawn attention to the Bible in every place where the English tongue is spoken to a degree never known before. From the humblest cottage—and he knew of one, in his own district, where a crippled young man might be almost constantly seen with a Revised Testament in his hand, and asking every neighbour who entered to compare one with the other—from the humblest cottage to the throne, it had drawn attention to the laws of God, and had drawn attention to them in a way which could not fail to be productive of immense good. It was impossible to have the good old Book too frequently before them; and the more they compared the versions with the original, the more they thought over its lessons and illustrations, the better it must be for them all. As had been so well said—

Who hath this Book, and reads it not
Doth God himself despise;
Who reads, but understands it not,
His soul in darkness lies.

Who understands, but savours not,
He hath no rest in trouble;
Who savours, but obeyeth not,
He hath his judgment double.

Who reads this Book, who understands,
Doth savour, and obey,
His soul shall stand at God's right hand
In the great judgment day.

The Rev. A. J. Ross said some of the speakers that morning had claimed for the Authorised Version of the New Testament the authority claimed for herself by the housekeeper of a Scotch minister. The minister said to Janet one day, "I am afraid you and me must part." "Indeed," said she, "I am surprised to hear that; where are you going to?" Good men in the past had drawn the water of life from the Old Version, but were exceedingly thankful for the New Version. There were a few passages which he wished had been left alone. He thought it was a misfortune that the revisers should have altered the Lord's Prayer from "deliver us from evil" into "the evil." Still, he thought the English Church would derive great gain from the revision. For instance, as regarded the completeness of the work of Christ, they now read that if one died for all, all died. Another improvement was that the passage in the Authorised Version, "if ye be risen with Christ" in the Revised Edition was, "you were raised with Christ." After quoting other instances of improvement in the Revised Version, one of which gave them more encouragement to hopefulness, he said surely they should not despair of the future of English Christianity, at any rate, after they had had such a Congress in Newcastle, presided over by such a bishop as the Bishop of Durham.

The Rev. E. Miller wished to call the attention of the Congress to the question, whether the Old Version was authorised or not. The Bishop of Lincoln had drawn attention to the fact that at the Hampton Conference it was to some extent authorised, and after that Conference it is certain steps were taken to authorise it. After the conclusion of the Hampton Court Conference, King James convened a meeting of all the Privy Council and the Bishops, in which "a general project" was drawn up. A copy of this "general project, or "Memorial," as it was also called, was left by the King with the Archbishop of Canterbury; and a transcript of it might be found in the collection of MSS. in the British Museum, called Cleopatra, in folio 2, 13, page 120. It was entitled concerning an order to be taken in some causes ecclesiastical, whereof most are expressed in certain articles contained in a schedule remaining with the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. And it contained a proviso, "That care be taken that one uniform translation of the Bible be printed, and read in the Church. And that without any notes." It is described in a letter of Bishop Matthew as "one uniform translation of the Bible to be used, and one only to be used, in all the churches of England." And it is added in the MS., "This is to the care of the Bishops." A copy of the MS. might be found in Strype's "Life of Whitgift," iv., c. xxxii., and one of Bishop Matthew's letters in Appendix xlv. to the same Life. It would seem that this was an authorisation by anticipation, but, as the print was not clear, he had thought it worth bringing before the Congress in the hope that some gentlemen who had studied the matter might be able to throw light upon it.

The Dean of Chester observed that it was a high satisfaction to a member of the Northern Convocation, who had advised the revision, to find that in spite of the adverse decision of that Convocation that Revision had taken place. There had been many unexpected difficulties in regard to the use of language in the Revision which no scholar could have provided against. Thus, one of the Revisers had told him that there was a very strong wish expressed on the other side of the ocean that the use of the word "corn" should be avoided in those places where wheat, &c., was referred to in the Authorised Version, because "corn" in America meant not wheat, but Indian corn or maize. To show the disadvantage which we had up to the present been suffering in consequence of having a defective translation of the Bible, he might point out that in the Authorised Version the word which meant a specially ordained deaconness, was made to mean the wife of a deacon. Had the word been properly

translated, English Churchmen would certainly not for the last three hundred years have been content to work without the help of an authorised female minister. In conclusion, the Venerable Dean said that the very defects of the Revision constituted one of its advantages. The question was being raised whether the Revised Version was likely to be or ought to be authorised for use in our Churches. But that was not the principal point for consideration. The main question was whether the Version was a final one, which could never be improved. It would be indeed a disastrous thing if it were. It would be a bad day for the Church if reverent and searching criticism had ever said its last word on the Greek of the New Testament.

The Right Rev. President said: I wish to utter this caution at the outset, that though a Reviser, I am not going to speak as a Reviser. I shall not reveal any of the secrets of the Jerusalem Temple. I think we may congratulate ourselves on the quality of the papers and the speeches which have been submitted to us to-day, and I am sure that I myself was most glad to hear such scholarly criticisms as the authors have delivered. I can assure Canon Evans that his lively and microscopic criticism will, so far as I am concerned, receive the utmost attention. May I say a word or two with regard to criticisms which have appeared from time to time in the newspapers and elsewhere. I have been surprised at the haste which these betray. Thus, for instance, in a London paper, which has a very wide circulation, the Revisers were told that a certain rendering in the Lord's Prayer, in St. Matthew, was quite intolerable to the English ear. Unfortunately, however, our critic did not turn to the version in St. Luke, or he would have found the same rendering there. This morning I read a very intelligent article in a Newcastle paper on this very subject. I find that one of the criticisms had reference to the rendering of the Revised Version in St. John of the fifth chapter, thirty-fifth verse. The writer of the article complained that the Revisers had abandoned the rendering with which they were familiar, "And he was a burning and a shining light," and had rendered it, "He was a lamp that burneth and shineth." I infer from that criticism that the writer really did not understand what was the force of the passage. I feel tolerably confident that ninety-nine persons out of a hundred reading the passage in the Authorised Version would not arrive at the right conclusion. We hear again and again "A burning and shining light" used as a term of unmixed eulogium. In the passage itself the force of the words is just opposite. There is a contrast between the Great Central Light—our Lord—the light which burns by His own inherent force; and this mere lamp, which burns only, which gives light only when it is set on fire and burns. That is in accordance with the general tenor of the references to St. John the Baptist in this Gospel of St. John, where again and again the inferiority of the messenger of this herald of the Gospel to the Messiah himself is proclaimed. So he is called a lamp—a mere lamp—not the light itself. These will serve as instances of the haste which characterises so many of the criticisms on this Version. I proceed to speak of certain classes of faults which have been found with the Revised Version. I am not careful to defend the Revised Version in detail. If I desired to do so the time would fail me. But I wish to touch on two complaints which have been urged against it, and to submit to your consideration some reflections with regard to them. First of all, we have heard much of the injury to the English rhythm. I will not venture to say whether that charge is just or not, but what I do urge is this, that we at present are not competent to judge on the subject. There is a particular rhythm in our ears. We are familiar with that, and simply because we are familiar with that we are not capable of doing justice to any other rhythm. The second complaint has reference to unnecessary variations. That is a very wide question; but I think the more you will look into the passages themselves and compare them with the passages against which that complaint has been brought, you will find that the Revisers, whether right or wrong, had reasons for what they did. I take as an instance the passage which I fancy would strike the English reader at once as coming under that category, and that is St. Matthew, vi., 7, "And in praying use not vain repetitions" instead of the "when you pray" in the Authorised Version. Well there is a difference in form with the original, and when you come to examine the passage you find that the two expressions refer to two different stages—"When you pray go not into your chamber," and "In praying use no vain repetitions." I give that as an instance to show how important it is to examine well the changes which the Revisers have made. Dr. Sanday pleaded for the lapse of considerable time before any revised version was imposed by authority. Now, I for one should be the last person to ask for any immediate action in this matter. It is of the utmost importance—I fancy that all the Revisers would think so—that their work should be thoroughly canvassed. But we must allow that too great delay is a real evil. I take a passage to which allusion has been made again and again, that in the First Epistle of St. John, relating to the three heavenly witnesses. You are really placing a stumbling block in the way of common people by letting that passage remain there. They discover accidentally that there is no authority for it whatever. Some popular secularist lecturer, or I know not who tells them that, and they jump to the conclusion that the great doctrine which appears in that page must be based upon it, and must therefore fall to the ground. The sooner we snatch away from the Bible such a text as that the better for us all. Well, then, I will take just another instance, and that has reference to the archaism, "Take no thought of to-morrow." You are telling your people this again and again. You know, perhaps, yourself—you may or you may not—that that is an archaism. "Take no thought" for "Be not anxious." But what are you doing? With one breath you are pleading for thrift, enforcing thrift on your people, and then in the next breath you are telling them that they are not to look forward to to-morrow. I happen to know what use has been made of this text, even by educated persons, political economists and others, who did not know that it was an archaism and read it as an objection to the Gospel. These evils, I contend, are not slight. I have little to add with regard to the position of the present Authorised Version—in fact nothing of my own—but I strongly urge those present to read the article by Mr. Randall Davidson in the October number of "Macmillan," in which he supplements the opinion of the Lord Chancellor with many important facts, which go far to modify it.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—If your "Perplexed" correspondent will append his name to his communication, I shall be happy to do my best to answer his question on the subject of "Evolution and the Fourth Commandment." It will save time if while so doing he will also state whether he considers that the words in the Fourth Commandment rest upon higher authority than the statements in the first chapter of Genesis.

T. G. BONNEY.

We regret to be obliged to hold over "Veritas's," "W. G. H.'s," "J. W. A.'s," and several other letters. Last week Chancellor Espin's able speech on the "Revised Version" should have appeared under the head of "Chester Diocesan Conference."

SUPPLEMENT
TO
The Church of England Pulpit,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XII.—No. 307. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1881.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—A correspondent, signing himself "John Hunt Lynn," whose letter appeared in the PULPIT last month (October 1st), observed that "*between great moral principles and real sanitary science* there cannot be, in the nature of things, the slightest possible discord."

His contention was that these Acts "are in direct antagonism with moral principles, and with the Word of God."

The discussion seems now to have arrived at a point when it is desirable to lay down some definite leading principles on behalf of his side of the argument, lest the discussion should be lost in vague generalities, built on false premises.

The turn the discussion has recently taken, in the direction of the varying "moral standards," of the Old and New Testaments, as to concessions and restrictions on the union of the sexes, according as the subject is regarded from a Mosaic or Christian point of view, leads me to call attention to the fact that the Revised Version of the New Testament will not bear the construction as to divorce and polygamy which has been placed on certain passages from the Sermon on the Mount, and St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Corinthians. As I have not time to go fully into the matter, in order to elucidate the points in which the New Version throws a fresh light upon certain passages in the Old, I will simply indicate two or three passages which seem to me at variance with the definitions of divorce and adultery, as bearing on the question of the sanction of polygamy under the New Dispensation, and there leave the matter for further elucidation by your correspondents, and with a hope that perhaps some light may be thrown on the subject in your editorial comments.

(1.) It is unnecessary for a divorced woman to marry another husband, while her first husband is alive, in order to become an adulteress, since "every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress." (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9—Revised Version.)

In the latter text the words of the former appear in the margin, but the sentence and verse omitted (ch. xix. 9) are to be found, with a slight variation, in Mark x. 11 ("committeth adultery against her"), in Luke xvi. 18, a variation which seems to me to strengthen the argument.

(2.) From Romans vii. 2, 3, it appears that the marriage bond is indelible in the case of the woman, as long as her husband liveth; and the argument I would found on these two passages, and on others of similar import, is that since these regulations bind women in the married state; they may be taken likewise to bind men who have accepted the marriage bond. They are both equally under a vow, or, as St. Paul renders it, under the law, and in the case of Christians they are further under the law to God, as to man, and what "God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (See also Romans vii. 6.)

(3.) This line of argument seems to me further to throw additional light upon the words, "So that they are no more twain, but one flesh." "And the twain shall become one flesh." (Matt. xix. 4—6.)

(4.) Then as regards the definition of adultery, it would appear that, in the face of Matt. v. 27, 28, the definition given in last week's PULPIT will not meet the requirements of the case, when viewed either from the point of view of the man's obligations or the woman's.

To sum up:—There are two relations in which a Christian husband and wife stand—(1) to each other and (2) to the Head of the Church.

A breach of the marriage bond—divorce—while it seems to sever only the husband from the wife, involves a greater separation, viz., that of the offender from the body of Christ's Church.

Divorce—save for the cause of fornication—involves adultery on both sides. This rules prevails, in spite of the exception named in 1 Cor. vii. 15—"the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases."

The marriage bond being otherwise indelible, death alone can "discharge from that law" (Rom. vii. 1—3). The strictness of this bond is illustrated by our Lord's reference to former times, when questioned by the Pharisees as to the Mosaic regulations of divorce (Matt. xix. 8), "From the beginning it hath not been so." (Also Mark x. 6.) The reference is not only to Moses and his concessions to the "hardness of heart" of the Israelites, but to a period antecedent to the Mosaic Dispensation:—"But from the beginning of the Creation, male and female made He them." We must therefore take these words to mean "man and wife."

This sanctions monogamy, and as the next verse has reference to "a man leaving his father and mother and cleaving unto his wife" (Mark x. 7—9), and "the twain becoming one flesh, so that they are no more twain, but one flesh," it inculcates a higher law than

that of Moses, and foreshadows the elevation of the marriage covenant under the New Dispensation beyond the status of a mere temporal contract, and indicates divorce and its frequent concomitant, polygamy, as violations of a Divine institution.

The divorce of a wife (unlawfully) and a subsequent marriage therefore becomes bigamy, even though the wife should subsequently commit adultery by marrying another husband.

Even if neither married again, there is no escape from the dilemma, since the rupture of the marriage tie ordained by God is a violation of His law, which is not consistent with the observance of the seventh Commandment.

Consort with a harlot results in the members of Christ being prostituted and made members of a harlot (1 Cor. vi. 15, 16, and Eph. v. 30—32). "This mystery is great," and, like other mysteries, must be accepted as an article of faith, when beyond human reason to fathom. But that our Lord never contemplated polygamy, as lawful in His followers, seems clear from Matt. v. 27, xix. 9—12. Had it been customary for the Jews in His time to have more than one wife, instead of saying (Mark x. 11), whosoever shall "put away his wife" (without reference to any lawful cause) "and marry another, committeth adultery against her," would He not rather have said, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *by marrying another*, committeth adultery against her?" since it is the loosening of the monogamic tie, which, in the view of St. Paul, saving for a cause indicated by him, which does not, however, contemplate a *second* marriage, constitutes fornication or adultery. (1 Cor. vii. 4—27, etc.

Nov. 8th, 1881. E. G.

P.S.—I throw out these suggestions for further discussion, having no books of reference at present by me.

[Our correspondent ought, we think, to construe the words of Scripture with some regard to their context; *e.g.*, in Matt. v. 27, 28, our Lord speaks of adultery as recognised by Jews, and obviously implies "that whosoever looketh upon a woman (the Greek word means also "a wife") to lust after her (unlawfully), hath," &c. Again, "male and female"—θέλυ καὶ ἄρσεν—cannot with any regard to accuracy be taken to mean "man and wife."—ED.]

SIR,—I have read with much interest your admirable leader of to-day, and also, among other letters, that of a lady, "An Inhabitant of Chatham." As I stated in a former letter which you were good enough to publish, I have visited the Government Lock hospitals at Chatham, Aldershot, Devonport, and the Government side of the London Lock hospital, as well as its voluntary side. I can confirm every one of your correspondent's statements as regards the excellent arrangements of the Chatham hospital, with the lady superintendent and surgeon of which I have conversed and frequently corresponded. Similar efforts to prevent the younger patients from being demoralized by the elder ones are made in all the Government hospitals, and I only wish we could do the same in our local voluntary Lock hospital. But alas! we have only two wards opening into each other; young girls only just debauched, married women infected by their husbands, and prostitutes of many years' standing are all together. I need not dwell on the consequences of such a state of things; it may be imagined. But it will be obvious that little or nothing can be done in the way of reformation. Now the hospital consists of one story only, and was so built with a view of being subsequently enlarged. But no money is forthcoming, though, as you have shown, thousands of pounds are spent yearly in fruitless attempts to repeal these Acts. I hope "Veritas" will be more careful in future to avoid untrue statements, or he will forfeit his claim to the *nom de plume* he has chosen. I also hope that he, "E. T.," and others of your readers and correspondents who oppose these Acts, will not accept mine or any other logic, but will pay a visit to some Government and some voluntary Lock hospitals. They will learn from the inexorable logic of facts, of which they are now ignorant, that these Acts are doing, in the places where they are enforced, that which religion, morality, philanthropy, police regulations, and all other influences have failed to do in places where the Acts are conspicuous by their absence. They will return sadder but wiser men and women, and their future letters, being founded, not as at present on ignorance, but knowledge, will be very different and much more worth reading.

There is a very practical view of the question which I should like to bring forward. In all our cathedral cities there is a religious centre, which is an enormous power for good. An archbishop or bishop lives near; a dean, canons, minor canons, and all the other officers of a cathedral staff dwell in the city itself. There are many wealthy and charitably-disposed laity of both sexes, and an unlimited supply of charitable organizations. And yet the "social evil" exists in all its hideousness; low brothels of the very worst description, filled with the lowest and filthiest of prostitutes, well-known to the local police, existing in every cathedral city. No doubt the circumstance is partly due to the almost invariable accompaniment of a garrison of soldiers, more or less large. But one would have expected that if such things existed under the very shadow of the church, that at least some means would be adopted to ameliorate such a condition of things by providing hospitals for the poor Magdalenes, homes for their reception when discharged cured, and means to prevent their ranks from being recruited. But what are the facts? With the exception of Canterbury, Winchester, and Cork, in which these Acts are in force, nothing is done in any cathedral city to mitigate the evil, and it is a very significant fact that the Town Council of Exeter and the military authorities of Dublin have each petitioned the Government to extend the benefit of these Acts to those two cities. And at the debate in the House of Commons in 1875, a letter was read from a magistrate of Chichester, giving a most deplorable account of the state of prostitution in that city, and urging the extension of the Acts to it.

You allude, Sir, to the ignoring of the sin of prostitution as virtually sanctioning it. This is too true, and the more so that the ignoring is well known to be wilful and dishonest. This was well shown by a writer in the *Lancet* many years ago. He says:—"There flourish at the West-end gorgeous houses, where passers-by see only the painted face of Jezebel look out of the window, from which sight virtue averts her face and blushes; yet we are asked to believe that she does not see or know why she turns away her head. The children of Cornelia inquire concerning 'the beautiful lady' whose quiet brougham stops the way at the door of the theatre or concert-room, and we are expected to assume that it is ignorance which makes the pure matron hesitate to answer them. Samson,

whose fine proportions are the envy of the domestic troops, drives Dalilah in the park; and we are asked to suppose that his sisters are unaware who it is sits by his side. The daughters of Dives, knowing all about the plot of the 'Traviata,' visit the opera to witness the apotheosis of a consumptive prostitute, and drive home through the Gehenna fair nightly held in the Haymarket; yet we are expected to credit that they lay their heads on their pillows without considering what it all means."

But now let us see what a well-known and popular novelist of the present day says respecting this. In his preface to one of his most interesting books, Anthony Trollope says :—"I have introduced in the 'Vicar of Bullhampton' the character of a girl whom I will call,—for want of a truer word that shall not in its truth be offensive,—a castaway. I have endeavoured to endow her with qualities that may create sympathy, and I have brought her back at last from degradation at least to decency. I have not married her to a wealthy lover, and I have endeavoured to explain that though there was possible to her a way out of perdition, still things could not be with her as they would have been had she not fallen. . . . . It is not long since,—it is well within the memory of the author,—that the very existence of such a condition of life, as was hers, was supposed to be unknown to our sisters and daughters, and was, in truth, unknown to many of them. Whether that ignorance was good may be questioned; but that it exists no longer is beyond question. Then arises that further question,—how far the condition of such unfortunates should be made a matter of concern to the sweet young hearts of those whose delicacy and cleanliness of thought is a matter of pride to so many of us. Cannot women, who are good, pity the sufferings of the vicious, and do something perhaps to mitigate and shorten them, without contamination from the vice?"

My letter is too long already, but, should you be pleased to continue the correspondence a little longer, I shall hope to show how, as it seems to me, clergy may do much to mitigate the evils of prostitution, both among men and women.

8th Nov., 1881. A SURGEON.

SIR,—Your Correspondent, "Cui Bono," seems almost to regret that no "suggestion likely to work" has been proposed "as a substitute for the operation of the above Acts." Quite agreeing with him, that they promote "callousness and social degradation," I think on the other hand that, in view of their approaching repeal, we should all take every precaution we can against any substitute for them whatsover being suggested. Those Acts were intended to benefit the men of the Army and Navy, by improving the health of *women on* the Register. Amongst those poor women disease has increased already 24 per cent. since their being passed; and whilst there may possibly be some dispute about Army statistics, there can be none about the increasing disease amongst the blue jackets. In 13 out of the 17 English stations under the Acts, the number of women on the Register is on the increase; this, according to police reports, and according to the *verbal* testimony of the superintendents at Canterbury and Colchester, not only in those towns, but in all the others, younger and younger girls are being put upon the Register, till, as one superintendent said, "Not only have I more and more girls each year, but they are all such as I ought not to have."

I may be told the mere *words* of a superintendent of spy police do not carry much weight. Possibly not! But certainly the International Medical Congress was the largest and most important gathering of doctors the world has ever seen. The Acts were discussed in two sections. In one not one English doctor ever stood up in favour of the Acts. In the other the few who spoke, with one exception, did not find enough matter for more than a three minutes' speech, although there was nothing to hinder them all speaking for ten minutes, if they could find anything to say in support of their opinions. And even then the doctors who condemned the Acts on *medical* grounds, were as three to two.

As I have never heard any one allege that there was anything whatsoever in the Acts that had any tendency to check vice amongst men, and as they have now been pronounced by such a high medical authority as that of these representative doctors at the Congress rather to tend to increase disease than to diminish it—an opinion borne out by the police reports showing an increase of disease among the women under them, I devoutly hope none will think out a substitute for them likely to work. There is quite enough sickness, quite enough vice amongst men, without our thinking out anything else likely to increase the former and certainly not diminish the latter.

Let us return to that, as it would seem, forgotten precept, "Make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof," not denying that the flesh has lusts, not shutting our eyes to the fact, but resolutely refusing either by polygamy, or polyandry, or legalised adultery, or any other form of State regulation of vice to make provision for those lusts. All those signed with Christ's cross in baptism probably recall those other words, "Crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts." "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." For those, not yet Christians, I can understand that it is a little difficult at first to realise that to take their pleasure and wax wanton is not even wise as far as this world is concerned. But the Gospel of salvation promises us far better things than immunity from shameful diseases, and its first call is always, "Repent ye," not "Satisfy yourselves."

It is a little difficult for me to answer the letter of "an Inhabitant of Chatham" (a lady), because it concludes "while the opponents can hold their meetings italics are not mine, and there have lately been Repeal-and spread *falsehood to their hearts' content.* The Meetings at Chatham, at Rochester, where the speakers were Mrs. Stewart of Strood, Mrs. Williams of Chatham, Mrs. Dale of Rochester, Mrs. Booth of Chatham, Mrs. Moir of Chatham, besides the deputation from the Ladies' National Association for the Abolition of Government Regulation of Vice. These meetings were held in the Jubilee Hall, Chatham, by the kind permission of the Congregational minister, and in the Council Chamber, Rochester, by the kind permission of the Mayor, were both very numerously attended, and were under the patronage of the wife of the Vicar of Rochester, of another clergyman's wife there, of the wives of most, if not all, of the Nonconformist ministers, of the Presbyterian Chaplain to the Forces, and of two late Mayors. Thus it is rather curious for an inhabitant of Chatham to accuse all these respected fellow-citizens of countenancing meetings for the purpose of *spreading falsehood.*

A paid official, under the Act, at the Rochester meeting, interrupted more than once, rather roundly accusing of falsehood Mrs. Steward, of Ongar, Essex, the lady who went once to Belgium, at the request of the Church Penitentiary Association, to fetch away a young English girl, detained against her will, in one of the houses of ill-fame, licensed by the Belgian Government, and who has several times received such unhappy victims under her own motherly roof. I am sure none would be more ready than Mrs. Steward to confess and apologise for any inaccuracy into which she might inadvertently be betrayed. She is a lady advanced in years, who never even attempted to speak in public till the age of fifty, but as she says, "These Acts would make even the dumb speak." And although accusing her of falsehood was somewhat uncourteous, yet one would always wish to make allowance for an intemperate expression into which any one might be betrayed in the heat of the moment. But although I listened with the utmost care, I could not help observing that the Hospital Superintendent did not set Mrs. Steward right even as to any trifling inaccuracy, when herself given full opportunity to speak, and even begged to continue, but chiefly dilated on the great advantages arising to every girl from being forced by law to come under her own care and spiritual ministration. A matter of too personal a nature for Mrs. Steward or any of our speakers to touch upon at a public meeting, and about which obviously there may be differences of opinion. There is nothing to hinder your correspondent from calling a Women's Meeting in support of the Acts, at which the truth might be as steadfastly adhered to as is within the capacity of the speakers. Nothing, I mean, but one thing, the same that made every woman at our crowded Rochester meeting (with the exception of the little company from the Lock Hospital), hold up her hand in favour of Repeal. At the same time I must point out to your correspondent that in the Government Lock Wards I have been over, there has been no arrangement for separating those girls who have made their "first slip," for the very good reason of their not being even admitted. The accommodation of the Government Lock Wards I have visited has been exclusively for women registered as "common prostitutes." And the Lady Superintendent told me she knew of many virtuous women who, in order to get into these wards, had had to submit, not only to be mixed up with women of bad character, but to be themselves registered as "common prostitutes." Possibly no respectable artizan's wife has ever gained admission into the Chatham Hospital in this way, but if the Chatham Hospital is well managed—I have not been over it—it is to me a little strange why Chatham alone, of all the subjected towns I have visited, should be full of tales of cruelty at that Hospital—tales which it must always be impossible either to prove or to disprove, but which certainly arouse grave thoughts in one's mind. I have been at very near all the subjected towns opposing the Acts, meeting people opposed to the Acts, and people who knew nothing about them, &c. Nowhere, but at Chatham, have I heard of cruelty at the Hospital, and except from the Manager of it and the present Chaplain, who has only very recently succeeded to the office, I did not hear a good word for it from any one.

At the same time it is possible this is to be accounted for by the feeling at Chatham being unusually strong against the Acts. They have been in force there ten years, and during the last four years the number of houses of ill-fame has increased from sixty-four to eighty-four, an appalling increase! especially if, as I heard there, there are very considerably fewer soldiers than formerly, and not more sailors. Anyhow, whether I spoke with Colonels, or dockyard labourers, men whose business was chiefly with torpedoes marked "urgent," or with fairly respectable women for the wives of their married men, I met with the same unwavering condemnation of the Acts, till at last, commenting upon this to the secretary of a political organisation, he replied :—"Why you see I live at Chatham. I know what the Acts are. Other people perhaps have only heard about them." It may be news to some of your correspondents that the Belgian Government, which alone in Europe makes State provision for the lusts of women, has lately decided to augment its revenue by levying a tax upon all foreign girls admitted into their State-licensed dens of infamy. Thus English girls will now command a better price in the white slave market, and unless our Government decides to extend protection to girls until they have reached an age at which it is possible to acquaint them with the dangers into which they now run blindfold, we may look for greater activity in the Belgian slave traffic. Your readers will remember, doubtless, that a girl with property is protected against seduction till twenty-one; a girl with parents till sixteen; a poor girl without parents till thirteen. Possibly the idea on the part of our legislators has been that women of maturer years should give instruction in such matters in our infant schools. I have not yet heard, however, of the School Board undertaking the task. Meanwhile some men stand by and see a child drowned before their eyes in Kensington Gardens rather than wet their feet, and others, the majority of us, are content to see little girls ruined wholesale rather than put the slightest legal check in the way of men gratifying their lusts.

There is not even legal punishment for men, who openly solicit women in our London streets. When a woman says how common and how disgusting it is, she is invariably met by the rejoinder "It must be your own fault." When a man complains that women solicit him, no answer of the kind is made to him, but the women are sent to prison. They are even sent to prison very often without his complaining. Meanwhile every poor young girl making her living in London walks now in the evening at her own risk. Her own hand may defend her from insult and importunity; the hand of the law never does. Yet the class of men who importune respectable women is probably quite as much a class apart different from other men, as the class of women who solicit men.

A. E. N. BEWICKE.

The corner-stone of a new church now in course of erection at Cwm, Ebbw Vale, Mon., was laid on the 25th ult. by Mr. Crawshay Bailey. It is being erected from the plans of Mr. John Norton, London, and the contractors are Messrs. W. Jones and Sons, Newport. The style of architecture is Gothic. The total cost will be about £1,300, towards which there is about £700 in hand. The service was conducted by the Rev. W. Hughes, M.A., vicar. At the close of the ceremony Mr. Bailey stated that it would give him great satisfaction to make up the amount of the deficiency himself, so that no debt would remain on the building. The clergy present were the Revs. W. Hughes, M.A., vicar, Albert Jordan, M.A., and J. Williams, curates, J. W. Morgan, T. Rees, and E. Jones.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MORALITY AND DOGMA.

BY THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, OCT. 30TH, 1881.

"By manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."—2 COR. iv. 2.

THE truth of which the Apostle is speaking here, the truth by the manifestation of which he commends himself to the conscience of every man was not, as we might have supposed at first, moral truth; it was dogmatic truth. We find in the following verses that the truth he is speaking of is what he describes as "the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ," as the "light of the glory of the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ." That is to say, it was not the moral precepts of Christianity, but it was that body of Christian doctrine concerning the person and the life of Jesus Christ, into which the Apostles, as we know, baptised their converts. It was that body of doctrine which we recite when we repeat the Apostles' creed. Now, of this teaching, it is said, that it commended itself to the conscience of every man. This is certainly a very remarkable, and, at first sight, almost a startling claim on behalf of dogmatic truth; for it does not, at first sight, appear to us how the faculty in us that judges of the right and wrong of actions can have anything to do with judging of the truth or falsehood of certain abstruse doctrinal propositions; still less does it seem to us clear how this relation between conscience and dogma can be so very close and so very evident that the very preaching of these propositions commends the preacher to the moral sense of his hearers. And accordingly, as you are most of you doubtless aware, the idea of there being any relation between doctrine about the supernatural—between religion, in short—and the human conscience, is utterly discarded by a large school of teachers and thinkers amongst us at this moment. Such persons strongly insist upon this: that, between dogma about the supernatural and the human sense of right and wrong there can be no possible relation. "How," they ask, "can it in the least affect my obligations to my fellow men in this world, to be told that it had a Creator; how does it affect my duty to do unto all men as I would they should do unto me, to know that the Person who said that, rose from the dead and ascended into heaven?" And we are assured that not only is it absurd to insist upon any relation between supernatural truth and the human conscience and morality, but that it is in the last degree dangerous to morality itself. For this, we are told, is nothing less than to link the future of human morality with the uncertain future of creeds and dogmas. "Join together," we are warned, "in any degree or measure religion and morality, and then morality must share the fate of religion. And if religions are about to die and to vanish away," as we are told they are, "and you have made morality in any measure dependent upon religion, ill must it fare with morality in the future." And accordingly these teachers are busy, many of them, just now, not indeed with any remarkable success, but with great pains and industry, in constructing what they speak of as a "scientific basis" for morality; finding, that is to say, physical reasons why men should be righteous, which shall stand the test of scientific examination, and which shall enable human morality to survive in the fast-coming day, when human knowledge will have enabled men to dispense with divine faith.

Now, before we accept this new basis for morality, before we give up the old belief—old as humanity and wide-spread as the human race—that there is a deep and close connection between religion and morality, let us, at least, in the first place, endeavour to ascertain what that relation really is, and what it is not. Let us clearly see, if we can, what it is, that dogma concerning the supernatural—such dogma as we find in our Creeds—can possibly have to do with the human conscience. And, in the first place, let us see clearly—and we can see clearly from the words of the Apostle—what it has not to do. Supernatural teaching is not, and cannot be, the external authority for moral obligation. It is not true, it is utterly and perilously untrue, to say that our duty to be moral rests upon any external command whatever. To say that I am bound to be honest and just in all my dealings with my fellow men because an Almighty Being has commanded me, under certain penalties, to be so is at once immoral and illogical. It is immoral if we rest the obligation solely upon the power of the Being who has commanded us, for that is to make might the only measure of right. It is illogical if we rest it upon His goodness; because His goodness can only be proved to us by the goodness of His words and actions, and, therefore, I must settle whether this particular word of His is good, before I can ascertain and decide for myself the fact of His goodness. We do not hesitate, therefore, to condemn, as untrue and unwise, the assertion that morality, rests upon external command. The law written upon our hearts is superior to any other law, however attested, and any law that contradicts this is self-condemned. The voice that bids me be immoral is a voice that I must resist, though it be a voice that stills the storm, or that wakes the dead. And this, observe

you, is exactly what the Apostle is teaching, in the words that I have read to you. He does not say to his hearers, "Receive us as divinely-sent messengers, who have wrought miracles in proof of our mission, and therefore allow us to dictate moral truth to you;" he says the very opposite to this—he says, "Listen to the truths we have to proclaim, judge them, in the first instance, by that supreme moral sense that He who sent us has given you, judge us by the conscience within you; if it reject these doctrines as immoral, reject us, whatever be our claim; if your conscience admits them to be moral, then listen to what more we have to say to you about our claim, to give you other teachings, or other commands; but, first, and before all things, we commend ourselves to the conscience of every man amongst you in the sight of the God who has sent us to minister to you." Most distinctly, then, does Christianity recognise the absolute supremacy of conscience.

But if this be so, if Christianity recognises the absolute and sole supremacy of the moral sense; if the supernatural in the Christian system makes no claim to dictate to us moral truth, then, we ask, what is the relation of the supernatural to the conscience? And now, to help us to understand this, let me ask you to observe particularly for one moment the form and manner in which the supernatural appears in the Creeds. It is very remarkable. It appears in a form that is strictly historical. The Apostles' Creed is almost entirely a recital of alleged historical facts; the facts of the supernatural, the Creation, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Descent of the Holy Spirit, appear in our Creed side by side, and, as it were, upon the same level with certain other historical facts in the life and death of Jesus Christ. In the same breath in which we say "conceived by the Holy Ghost" we say "born of the Virgin Mary;" in unbroken following of sentences we say, "crucified under Pontius Pilate, dead and buried," and then go on to say, "rose again the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty." It is all one unbroken, continuous, connected historical narrative. It is the supernatural appearing within the sphere of the natural, and appearing as simple historical fact. It comes to us, you observe, in the very meaning of its own title, as news—good news, we have agreed to say. It is intelligence, it is information, it is light that the Creed claims to give us. Light! I ask you to pause on the word. The Creed with its supernatural story of supernatural fact comes to us as light—light "of the knowledge of the glory of God." It comes to us from Him, of whom it is said, He is "the light of the world," and the light that comes from Him is "the life of men." What light, then—and this is the question for us to decide—what light does this story of the supernatural shed upon the human conscience? Surely the human conscience needs light. We know of no faculty in human nature that so much depends upon light as the human conscience—light as to the law by which it is to judge each human action. All know the difference between an informed and an ignorant conscience, and all can remember instances in history in which this supreme judge within us has made terrible, and pitiless mistakes because it has judged amiss. For conscience is not the law of our actions. Conscience is the judge, and like every other judge, it decides according to the recognised law of the day in which it is acting and judging. But I am not now speaking of this kind of light, all important as it is—I am speaking of another light thrown upon another far deeper and far darker question, and that is not as to the law by which the conscience is to judge, but as to the authority which the conscience has to judge at all. The question that lies at the very root and basis of all morality is this—not whether there is any law of morals or what it is—but whether there be such a thing as morality at all; not how the conscience shall judge, but why it claims to judge, and what is its right to do so? This is the question above all others that we need light upon, because we maintain that this is the question which underlies the basis of morality in any form whatever. What right has my conscience to judge my actions? If I may venture for one moment to refer to a former sermon here, those of you who may remember what I then said upon the subject of conscience may perhaps call to mind that I argued then that the right of the conscience to rule the man, and to judge his actions, if you view it merely in the light of nature, if you view it strictly in the light of science, is at least disputable; this we cannot say of any force in nature, except in a metaphorical way, that it has a right to rule any other force. All that we can say as really a matter of fact is, that it does always rule; and, therefore, as I have said in a metaphorical way it may be said to have a right to rule, just as when we combine two chemical elements we say that we expect that one of these—the stronger—will rule and dominate the other. That is all. But then when we remember, as a matter of fact, that conscience does not always rule; when we remember that its voice is so often over-ruled, so often silenced, by the clamour of the passions and the appetites—by what theologians call the lower parts, but what men of science must call the stronger parts, of our nature: when we remember this, we can find no scientific authority, no demonstrable basis for the right of the conscience to rule the man. But, having reminded you of my having said this once here, I am now about to go further, and to say this: not merely is the right of conscience to supreme rule and authority a thing disputable in the light of science, but if we are to read it in the light of some of the latest

utterances of science, it is a thing demonstrably and absurdly false. What is the last light shed upon our nature by the last discoveries of materialistic philosophy? It is this, that we are machines, pure and simple, that what we call will and choice are only sensations which accompany, but which in no way cause or produce certain other sensations and actions of our nature—mere secretions of the grey matter of the brain which accompany the movements, the automatic movements of that automatic machine which we call man; but of which to predicate the words right or wrong, to say there is anything moral attaching to them means no more than when we say that a watch keeps wrong time; or that the compass is guilty of aberration. Nay, it does not even mean so much as this. There is less scientific right upon the principles of materialism to say of a man that he goes wrong, than there is to say of a watch that it keeps wrong time; for when we say that a watch keeps wrong time, we mean this, that it is a machine constructed for the purpose of keeping right time; and when we say it ought to keep that time, but does not, we mean that it fails to accomplish the purpose of the maker of this machine. That is, we argue on the doctrine of design: we regard a watch or a compass as intended to carry out the will of the maker of the machine; but that is the very thing which materialism sternly, contemptuously, forbids us to say of the universe or of man or of any single fact like humanity. If we say that it had a design or designer, we provoke the scornful laughter of the modern philosopher, who tells us that this is a fit argument for the unscientific divines of the last century, but to bring it forward now is an anachronism and an absurdity. Be it so; materialism then forbids us to admit the idea of a final cause or aim in man's whole nature. Then why is it that when the materialist is constructing his scientific basis of morality, he must, if he will not use words and language perfectly absurd, speak as if he believed there was a design in man's nature? Must he go back—must the materialist go back—to the old exploded idea of a final cause; of a maker and his purpose, before he can find a scientific reason for saying of a man that he has done wrong or that he has done right? Where is the scientific basis for morality here? Curious, certainly, in a scientific point of view, strangely curious it is that this automatic machine should now and then seem to check itself, and tremble at its own movements; strange and curious it is—for it is a sentient machine—that it should, in some way or other, seem to inflict pain upon itself when its movements do not correspond with the directions of some internal force; strange it is that the grey matter of the brain should secrete these conscientious sensations. Matter for scientific inquiry, doubtless, it is; but matter for moral obligation, reason for saying—in the sense in which men do say it, when they talk of morality—this is right or that is wrong, why, that is to go back to the exploded science and the mistaken morality of the eighteenth century. The nineteenth century is more advanced. Yes, such is so far the result of the attempt to find a scientific basis for morality. The result is that the conscience in man fails to justify itself to the sceptical understanding; the authority within us, yields like the authority without us, to the perpetual solvent of the perpetual question of the purely sceptical understanding, which asks why, why, and still why is this? And if you will not allow faith to rise up against it in defence of the authority without, at least, be consistent and refuse to allow any kind of faith the right to rise up against it in defence of the authority within. And thus the sceptical understanding flushed with the success of its assault upon the outward bulwarks of religion, will surely, will inevitably, proceed to assail upon the same ground, and, in may be, with the same success, the very inner fortress and citadel of humanity—the human conscience. And let no one say that this is merely an imaginary assault; let no one tell us that we are merely conjuring up a chimera of the pulpit to scare men back into the moralities of religion. It is not so. In all the history of mankind nothing is more certain than this, that at those periods at which religion was attacked assaults upon morality inevitably appeared. It was so in Greece; it was so in Rome; it is so at this day in England. What else is the meaning of all that literature of Pessimism by which men delight to prove not only that there is no God, no soul, no hope, no hereafter, but also that there is no real virtue, no true morality, no reason why we should be moral, no hope of the final triumph of righteousness, nothing but the miserable conflict between the appetites and conscience, between morality and desire, which distracts men now, and is to go on distracting them for ever and ever? What is the meaning of that modern Nihilism which rages frantically, not only against revealed religion, but against the family, against marriage, and against all the sanctities and purities of human life? What is the meaning of that outbreak of modern Paganism in our own English literature that disgraces and defiles it from time to time, as it oozes out in cynical Nature-worship, in the hymning and praising of the beast in man, insisting still that "whatever is, is right?" What is the meaning of all this but the successful assault of the sceptical understanding on the scientific basis of morality? What is it but the pleading of the sceptical part of our nature, holding now, as ever, its retaining fee from the passions that makes its assault upon all things that men hold dear within them, as before it made its assault upon all things that men held dear without and around them. Such contest and such assault must continue so long as there are passions and appetites in man that rage

against whatever resists or restrains them. We do not deny—God forbid that we should—that there are materialists among us who resist these assaults upon their own morality. We do not deny—God forbid that we should—that there are materialists infinitely better than their own unhappy belief; as, on the other hand, there are too many Christians worse and lower than their own nobler faith. But we do say that the materialist who does this is unconsciously, though happily, exercising an act of faith. He is unconsciously resolving to believe—in spite of all scientific evidence to the contrary—that he is a moral being; he is resolving to believe that he has a nobler and better self. But he deceives himself when, because of this, he imagines that, despite of scepticism, morality will survive. There are men here and there who might in that case still be moral, but let the restraints of religion be completely swept away, let the idea of the supernatural vanish—not only from this or that calculating and prudently moral leader of human thought, but from the minds of the vast multitude who suffer from the passion, the temptation, the trial, the sorrow of the hour—let these be left with only a scientific basis of morality, and then we should see the result. You would find that you would in vain strive to bind the passions and the desires, the needs and the sorrows of mankind, with such bonds of flax, as are your philosophic maxims of morality. The consuming fire of passion in human souls would burn them out, and men would walk with a new sense of licentious freedom from any consciousness of sin. The paradise of materialism would lie open before emancipated humanity. The fiery sword of old terrors which, flaming and turning every way, deterred men from entering there, would have been snatched from the hands of superstition by science, and the multitude would rush in to eat, or strive to eat of all its fruits, and would make of that paradise what unsatiated lust and unsatisfied desire have made of other paradises from the first—a hell upon this earth.

And, now, as we have seen that the scientific basis of morality does not help us much in this matter, let us see whether we can find any support for morality in the manifestation of the supernatural. What is it, as I have said, that the light of the Creed really is? It is the supernatural appearing in the domain and sphere of the natural. What does it tell us? It tells us that this existing natural order is not all in all, has not been from ever, shall not be for ever. It tells us that before it, around it, beneath it, overruling it, embracing it, explaining and alone truly explaining all its phenomena, is another order, the supernatural, which is from everlasting to everlasting, and it tells us that this supernatural order had a supernatural origin—that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It tells us further that our place in this natural order of things is something more than natural—it is supernatural; that God created man in his own likeness and image; that He has given him that moral nature which forbids him to sin; that He has given him that supreme authority over his lower nature, which, in the outer world, he has given him over the whole realm of material nature. It tells him that those impulses within him which bid him sin not and do right, are relics of the older order which once existed, and that they testify to him that this existing order of nature is not all in all, that it is not the mere mechanical action of blind mechanical forces moving to and fro in some unaccountable order, which though so orderly has no design in it, and had no designer; but that he is a moral being placed in the midst of a great system of order, not a chaos, but a cosmos divinely ruled, divinely ordered, dominated by the supernatural will of a Holy God, "in Whom we live and move, and have our being." It tells him that the voice of conscience within him is the voice of God, and that it testifies by His bidding to nobler, to higher, to truer, to more intelligent order, than one of mere soulless machinery and brute force of law. This is what the manifestation of the supernatural does for us, but why are we to believe what it tells us? Why are we to believe that in listening to it we *are* listening to the voice of our Maker telling us how we are made, and why, and for what purpose we are made. What reason have we for supposing that the supernatural overrules the natural? For this reason, that the supernatural has appeared in the midst of the natural as a higher and overruling force; for this reason, that the voice which tells us of the supernatural has stayed the courses of the natural; for this reason that miracle has appeared, attesting the existence of the supernatural, deflecting apparently and disturbing those laws which otherwise we might have held to be from everlasting to everlasting, and to be all in all. The rift in the cloud of the natural tells us whence comes the light in which we live: for it shows us the sun—the eternal sun—the Godhead which has created, and that is enlightening the world. And therefore is it that Miracle, as it gives us room to pray, gives us also the right to stand up and in the name of the supernatural to claim the supremacy of the conscience. There is a voice from without, which tells us that passion and appetite in us are inevitable as the storm, and resistless as the tides; and we answer no! in the name of that voice which commanded the winds and the waves, and straightway there was a great calm. There is a voice within us which whispers, "You are but a chemical compound of atoms come into visible existence at birth, and resolving itself back again at death into the elements of which it is composed. What matter is it how you live? Eat, drink, and be merry." And we answer to it: "No! in the name of Him whom the grave could not hold,

who rose from the dead and ascended into heaven." And this we claim to be the province of the miraculous and the supernatural in the matter of the human conscience.

Let me, then, finally sum up the arguments which I have been endeavouring to impress upon you in this sermon:—We do not, when we say that the supernatural helps us to a basis of morality,—we do not say that it dictates to us moral truth; we do not say that it helps to terrify men into being moral by the promise of heaven or the terrors of hell. A man, who does right only for the sake of heaven or only through the fear of hell, can hardly be called moral. We do not say this, but we do say that the supernatural throws light upon facts in our nature, which justify, and alone can justify, our claim to be moral. We do say that—not to overrule or tyrannise over the conscience—but to give to it its full and rightful authority, the voice of the supernatural has been heard amongst men. We do say that the manifestation of the supernatural has come amongst men to strengthen the basis of morality; to widen and deepen that basis upon which it erects its throne; to give it back its old supremacy, and crown it with the crown which is "the light of the glory of the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ." This, we maintain, is the office of the supernatural in helping us to find a basis for morality. More, far more, we might have said, had time allowed it, as to the relation not merely of the supernatural, but specially of the Christian idea of the supernatural, as regards human morality. We have not time, we could not have had time to do more than touch just the fringe of this great subject. Let us entreat you to follow it out in thought for yourselves. Think, for instance, how the Christian doctrines of sin, of atonement, of forgiveness, and of sanctification, speak to the moral sense of man; think how Christianity dignifies and deepens the motives for all just dealings with our fellow men, as it tells us that each fellow man is a brother, because God is our common Father; and that as life in each of us is not the mere span of natural existence, but an immortality, we are dealing in all our actions with one who, like ourselves, derives his descent from God, who comes from God and goes to Him. Think again of the connection of morality with the great doctrine of Christian holiness, something far wider, something that lies outside the precepts of mere morality, that doctrine which bids man be pure in his own secret and innermost thought, because that thought is laid bare before the eyes of an All Holy One, who cannot endure to look upon iniquity. Think of the help to morality in the doctrine of the descent of the Holy Spirit of God that He may make men holy, that He might gather them into one Holy Catholic Church, one communion of saints, whose object it is to "live righteously, soberly, and godly in this present evil world." Think of the exquisite morality of Christ as a Teacher; think of the glorious hope, of the triumph of holiness, in the example of that one perfect and sinless life; think of the effect of all this upon the human conscience, and upon human morality, and then try to realize what would be the effect upon the world of the blotting out of all this. Yes! To those who tell us that between conscience and Christian dogma there is no relation—we say that whether the dogma be true or false, it is manifestly absurd to say that, if true, it does not touch the very basis and root of all morality, namely, the question whether man is, or is not, a moral being, whether he has, or has not, anything more than an imaginary or superstitious right to judge his own actions. That is the question of our own day, and of days that are very near at hand. We say then to those who scornfully reject the idea of the supernatural in its relation to morality, do not at any rate imagine it to be one of pure indifference. Reject, if you will, with a smile, or with a sneer, our old world dream of the supernatural. Tell us, if you will, that it is but a faint relic of ancient superstition, when we believe that there was once a golden age of purity, and that there shall be again an abode for mankind, where nothing that defileth or hurteth can enter. But do not mock us with the assurance that when all this has vanished away the basis of morality shall stand securer than ever. Do not ask us to believe in your prophecy of a millennium of materialism, which cannot justify itself to the science to which it appeals. Let us, if it must be so, face together with what grim and desperate courage we may, the coming night of moral darkness, in which men shall grope to and fro in search of some reason for morality, drunken with the wine of their own passions, and stumbling over every stumbling block of temptation; but do not tell us that the shadows of this coming night are streaks of the day-dawn. Do not deceive yourselves by mistaking the after-glow of the setting sun of Christianity in your own heart for the dawn of a morning, that shall never come to you. We do not believe that darkness to be near at hand for all; we do not believe that it will wrap this world, in which Christ has lived and died, and risen again, in endless night; and we do not believe it, for this reason, that deep within the soul of man there lies that mighty evidence of the conscience which, being light, craves for light, and bids man seek for it as the plant unconsciously seeks for the light of the sun. That light may be quenched in individual souls. Nay, even here and there on some portion of the earth's surface, in some territory wherein, for a time, unbelief may have succeeded in crucifying the Son of man afresh, and putting Him to an open shame—above that modern cross there may be darkness in the heavens for a little space; but, spite of this, the soul of man will crave and seek light and knowledge; and in that light shall it see light, and men shall continue to rejoice and believe in "the

light of the glory of God," because that light, as seen "in the face of Jesus Christ," can never cease to "commend itself to the conscience of every man."

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1881.

ON DIVISIONS WITHIN THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. CANON MEADE, M.A., Rector of Winkfield, Wilts.

In the Prayer for Unity, commonly used in Church gatherings, we ask of God, in a very solemn appeal to Him, to "give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions," *presumably* divisions within the body of the Church itself; for, though divisions, of whatever kind, are in their very nature, sources of weakness to any society, yet of all divisions, *internal* divisions are the most perilous, and the most to be deprecated. In the memorable Battle of Leipzig, in which the great blow was struck upon the first French Empire, it was when the Saxon contingent of the Imperial army turned its cannons against the very lines of which it formed a part, that an augury of defeat was delivered more terrible and more decisive than had previously arisen from all the overt operations, formidable as they were, of the allied armies. In the words of Hannibal: "Prævalida corpora ab externis causis tuta videntur, sed suis ipsa viribus onerantur." And so it is with the Church of England, not indeed with that inmost body of spiritual members who are as the kernel to the nut, or as the jewel to the case, the fellowship of saints, but with that outer body in which they live, the organization to which they belong, and which is indeed what we commonly understand by *the Church*.

Now, the Church is manifestly divided, whenever those who have originally belonged to her Communion have separated themselves, and formed an organization of their own, with a government and ministry independent of, and disowning, her authority. And these divisions have, naturally, an evil tendency, though they are constantly overruled for great good, in provoking emulation, increasing watchfulness, and stimulating activity. But, of these divisions, though much might be said, the time for saying it is not *now*.

(*a.*) Our proper subject is *Divisions within the Church*, and these are of two kinds, corresponding with the two elements of which unity consists. That was genuine unity, when, as we read of the primitive disciples:—"They continued steadfastly in the Apostolic *doctrine* and *fellowship*." And thus, wherever there is a deviation from the *doctrine* maintained by the Church, or an innovation in the *order* of the Church, whether established by statute or long usage, there is division *within* the Church.

(*b.*) In descending to particulars, we may at once put aside, as regards *both points*, such variations as are minute, and only circumstantial. Apostolical doctrine, represented, in our present view, by the doctrine of the Church, may be faithfully held and taught, with *considerable diversity;* just as, in the Scriptures of Truth, one inspired writer, like the author of Proverbs, or the Epistle of St. James, will be more frequent and large in enforcing the fruits of the Spirit, as exemplified in the *conduct* of believers; another, like St. Paul or St. John, more occupied in setting forth the deep things of God, and expounding the mysteries of the Gospel Kingdom. In one sacred writer we find the Gospel on its *historical*, in another on its dogmatic, and in a third on its practical side, more fully presented. It is, nevertheless, *the same Gospel;* each writing contains "the whole counsel of God," the diversity being apparent, *only* in the *proportion* of the constituent parts. *Such* diversities, accordingly, as do not transgress the limits of sound doctrine held by the Church on the sure warrant of Scripture, and embodied in her formularies, however *injudicious*, we may sometimes think them to be, and however ill-calculated they may seem to us, to promote the great and glorious ends of the ministry—the winning of souls, and the building-up of believers, and the supplying a suitable portion, in due season, to all the household of faith—are yet to be exempted from the charge of being schismatical, or causes of division.

(*c.*) It is far otherwise, when, for example, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, contrary to the express caution of the Church itself: "We must take heed lest of a *memory* it be made a sacrifice," is represented by teaching, and exhibited in action, as an unbloody indeed, but yet as a propitiatory sacrifice, when all but Transubstantiation in *many* cases, and, in *some* cases, a trifle more, is maintained; and, connected with this Sacrament, auricular confession strongly recommended; when prayers for the dead, not merely "pro piis defunctis," that they, together with us, may have their full consummation and bliss, but for their deliverance from intermediate chastisement are recommended; when it is taught, almost as a matter "de fide," not only that the Church is the great appointed channel of spiritual life and growth; but that, outside its proper organisation, whatever may be the evidences of faith towards God and the adorable Redeemer, and however blameless a walking through the world, as strangers and pilgrims, seeking an abiding city, there is yet no *covenant promise* or hope of salvation. In all such cases, when the office and authority of the Church are assumed, and yet the Church has either positively repudiated or failed to sanction the tenets involved, there the teaching cannot be other than *schismatical* and a cause of division, and it can be no breach of charity to say of the teachers, that they are disloyal to the unity of the Church.

(*d.*) And, surely, no less is this true where, on the *opposite* side, *Rationalism*, in the shape of Pelagianism, and semi-Pelagianism, of Arianism, or even of Socinianism, under cover of the dignity and perfectibility of our humanity, is being prominently taught, the Sacraments of Grace lowered into bare memorials or symbols of Christian profession, where the *sinfulness* of sin, the awful curse *under the law* upon every soul that *obeys* not, and under the Gospel the *wrath* of God abiding upon every soul that *believes not*, and the exclusion from the Heavenly Kingdom of every sinner, even a professed disciple, except he be so *converted* as to be like—what he is naturally *so unlike*—a little child in teachableness and simplicity, are

thrown altogether into the shade, or even virtually superseded, as some worn-out or antiquated garment. And of both these causes of division we have sad examples on the one side in Bishop Colenso and the Essayists, and on the other in the Incumbent of St. Alban's, and, most notably, in those extreme Ritualists who have gone so far as to establish a distinct and secret Episcopate of their own.

(*e.*) This brings us to those causes of division which arise from diversities of *administration.* The clear, and, may we not say, the *wise* design, of our Church Reformers, was to constitute in this realm, at least, a harmonious and united Church, like Jerusalem, "built as a city at unity with itself;" and this was clearly expressed in a clause in the preface, the same in substance in the first and second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., as in our own :—"And whereas, heretofore, there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm, some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln; now *from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use.*" So that, we may add, a member of the Church of England, who should set out from Canterbury for York, and make a halting-place in each diocese on his way, should find, substantially, the same sanctuary and the same worship at each successive stage, and have the great privilege, in all alike, of finding himself at home. The unity of the Church of England is a unity of all the dioceses in the public service of God in the sanctuary, and by consequence of all the congregations in each several diocese. It will follow that *congregationalism*, or the independence of each congregation, as complete in itself, is directly *precluded*, and that, wherever it is successfully attempted, there unity is broken. Now, we have only to exercise a little observation to be convinced that the "unhappy divisions" which we are taught to lament, are to be found increasingly numerous in this particular direction. Nay, more, it is noticeable that already it has been advocated by some ardent friends, as they would appear, of the Church of England, as a remedy for her acknowledged perils, to widen the basis—as they would express it—of our ecclesiastical organization, so as to comprehend, as of equal right, congregational differences in divine service, as great as ever distinguished the uses of Sarum, Hereford, and Lincoln, and much more material. And these, which I have called *congregational* differences, appear especially, where they are most dangerous, in the *celebration of the Eucharist.* And as there are differences in the celebration, so are there differences in the reception. Crossings, gestures, and gesticulations—strange and bewildering to old-fashioned Churchmen—are now commonly to be observed, more especially amongst *neophytes* of both sexes, elevations on one side, and almost prostrations on the other, till the very accomplishment of that act of holy worship, which is most awful and soul-elevating, when presented in its simplicity, is turned into a matter of technical performance, and has a ritual connected with it which (we are seriously told) constitutes "a science in itself."

For these variations, on the side of those who minister, and of congregations, it may be with certainty affirmed, that no countenance whatever is afforded by the laws and customs of the Church. For, supposing the Ornaments Rubric to stand unmodified by the advertisements of Elizabeth, the cope and the alb—no stole even is mentioned—would be the only addition to our usual dresses of ministration, and would leave all the implements of scenic and symbolical display, whether in bodily gestures or dress, together with incense and attitudes, destitute of all sanction as much as ever. At the root of all these variations, as far as they are justified by the authors of them, and by those who adopt them, lies the treacherous and most mischievous claim,—that it is lawful to introduce into the services of our Church whatever vestments or forms, at any time employed, have not been expressly forbidden by the Church of England. It is impossible, if this claim be allowed, or if it be not uncompromisingly resisted, that any thing like unity can be maintained in the Church—any thing but that most delusive comprehension, which consists in "*union without unity*"—a combination, *mechanical* instead of *chemical*, where different elements are enclosed in one vessel, but will never blend—where, in appearance, they may be one, while essentially they are distinct. Were this principle allowed to have its course, it is far from improbable that such disorders would ensue, as once made the Church assemblies at Corinth to be scenes of scandalous confusion, or such as in this land shocked all sense of propriety, at a time when Romanism had imperfectly given way, and the Reformation was still incomplete.

It may be noticed, I think, that one *real*, if not principal, source of these perilous variations, is to be found in one most significant word—a word once only used in all the Scriptures—*ἐθελοθρήσκεια*, and which is interpreted by Suidas as *ἰδίῳ θελήματι σεβεῖν τὸ δοκοῦν* —a disposition to have *one's own way*—carried into the worship of God : to maintain the individual *τὸ δοκοῦν* under the plea of conscience, at all events and at every cost.

Carried out legitimately, this principle, if it deserves the name, leads to the authorising an individual rule for each individual person, and is therefore, in the highest degree, schismatical in its tendency, and the cause of internal divisions.

The Church of England, in whose sanctuaries we minister, is the Church Reformed; but if the internal divisions, of which we speak, be suffered to run their course, that will inevitably be the result—for many a day and year the *avowed* object of the *chief innovators* —the *undoing* of *all which the Reformers* did, and for which the *martyrs* of the Reformation shed their blood—and making our Church to be, as they would style it, the Church *restored*, or as her loyal members would sadly regard it, the Church *relapsed.*

Either these changes (I speak all along with a reserve of mere circumstantial variations) are held to be *matters of taste*, or to be matters of principle. If the former, then it is surely grievous to sacrifice unity by fostering divisions, for a trifle; if the latter, as all the leaders contend, then they are revolutionary and subversive of the foundation of the Church. The true principle appears to be this—and in no other way can unity be kept and divisions avoided—that no changes should be admitted in vestments or ministrations, or in the manner of receiving the hallowed elements, whether it be on the side of restoring the obsolete, or improving existing forms, without the general consent and sanction of the Body. And if this cannot be obtained, then it may be a matter of self-denial; but it will be, we may assure ourselves, a wholesome discipline to maintain, in the meanwhile, the "status quo."

Anyhow, all these diversities, whether of doctrine direct or indirect, or of administration capricious or conscientious, are peculiarly perilous to the body of

the Church. They have already, like so many wedges, penetrated deeply into the framework of our Tabernacle, and it is past hope that it will, for any considerable time longer, withstand the pressure. And it is still the more grievous when we contemplate these divisions as presented in the face of the numberless sects on one side, and Romanism on the other; while Scepticism and *Atheism*, and the god of this world are coming upon us like the great tidal wave in the river Ganges, ready to swallow us up. Rome especially, our ancient adversary, is winning her way, and setting up her monuments of victory all through our dioceses, and we are divided into camps, and waging war with one another; and, surely the shame with which the poet branded the civil strife which he recorded, may be too truly charged upon ourselves :—

"Cumque superba foret Babylon spolianda trophæis,
Bella geri placuit, nullos habitura triumphos."

THE HARVEST HOME.

We have found for the last few weeks, in almost every newspaper that comes to hand, some notice taken of these interesting annual gatherings, and the accompanying church services. We recollect the time when these were few and far between; but it is now quite the reverse, they are now the rule and not the exception, particularly throughout the Principality of Wales. I shall not at present, in any case, take upon myself to decide, or even to give an opinion, as to whether the custom of "excessive decoration of churches at harvest festivals"—as the Bishop of Liverpool expresses himself in his recent Charge—as is now the case in many of our churches, should be encouraged or discouraged. Nor shall I, at present, say a word as to whether our churches should be dressed up at all in any way at any of our annual church festivals, or not. I shall let this be an open question, at least for the present. But I believe myself that these annual gatherings and services are really interesting in themselves, and that they afford very suitable opportunities for the people to meet together to render their thanks unitedly and publicly unto the Giver of "every good and perfect gift" for the kindly fruits of the earth; and for which we have abundant proofs and precedents in the Old Testament history to go by. But what I wish most particularly to call attention to at present is the unworthy custom or habit of many of our preachers, on these great occasions, to go from ten to a couple of hundred miles from home to preach a sermon upon almost every conceivable subject but the one before them! A stranger is almost always asked to preach at these festivals, and the preachers are also, I believe, as a rule, published a Sunday or two before in the church; circulars are sent about to friends, and placards posted up here and there in conspicuous places; and the consequence of all this is, there is a great interest created in the neighbourhood. The matter gets talked about; an anxious desire is created to see the time; the preacher's standing and abilities are discussed, and the people promise to themselves a kind of a religious treat. The organ or the harmonium is seen to be in good tune, the church choir is nightly exercised, the village schoolmaster and parish clerk are full of smiles, and stand on the tiptoe of expectation. And so between the preacher or preachers and the singers we are going to have a treat! But no sooner has the preacher announced his text for the first time than the people begin to look knowingly at one another with a kind of a contemptuous smile; they put their heads down and send a kind of an electric titter throughout the church! Bye-and-bye the knowing ones are seen to look at the preacher full in the face with all the gravity they can command, and they tell him silently in their minds, "Yes, sir, go on, that's all very good in its season, but this is a harvest-home festival, and not a funeral occasion. To-day is the day of grace and not the day of judgment," &c. These and many like inappropriate subjects have been preached upon over and over again at harvest-home festivals. These, no doubt, are most momentous subjects, and nothing more so can be presented to the mind of man. But unfortunately they are out of place and out of time, and they plainly show, to say the least of them, a certain want of taste, of care and labour, on the part of the preacher. We may excuse a young man (who is very seldom, though, asked to preach on these occasions) for this lamentable state of unpreparedness and want of taste, but we cannot excuse an old stager or a man of standing in the Church. When a man is invited to preach at a harvest-home festival, or at the re-opening of a church, or at a church choral festival, or indeed on any particular day or occasion, no matter what it may be, he ought not to accept the invitation unless he is prepared to do justice to the subject; or if unprepared when he accepts the invitation, he should retire to his study at once, and stop there until he is capable of saying something suitable to the occasion upon which he is called to speak. When any member in the House of Commons deviates in the slightest degree from the subject under consideration, you will hear it immediately shouted, "Question, question!" If you would apply this infallible rule to the pulpit, I am afraid you would hear the word *Question* shouted out far too often to make it agreeable to many a preacher of the present day!

It will not do always to "saddle the old horse," "to play eternally the same old tune," "to rub the same worn-out fiddle," *ad captandum vulgus et ad nauseam.* Where this occurs the parson of the parish is disappointed, though he may for many good reasons let it pass unnoticed at the time, and he may be gentlemanly enough even to offer the preacher the ordinary cheap "thanks" for his futile and miscarried exertions! But the worst of all this is, the congregation are disappointed too, as well as the minister. The minister may have the common-sense to ruminate over the matter in silence, and let it pass as an inevitable evil; but he cannot shut the mouths of others, hence the thing cannot be easily shaken off.

The few words that are added to many a sermon on these occasions are too palpably far-fetched to be appreciated; and the consequence is, that the whole address is neither one thing nor the other. The ordinary Church daily service, beautiful and perfect as it is, is now altered on these occasions, different lessons from the ordinary ones of the day are used, and different Psalms and Collects or prayers are selected; why not give us also appropriate sermons? Let those so-called "dignitaries of the Church and fat rectors" who are well-clothed, roll in their carriages, and fare sumptuously every day, tell me if it is not *infra dig.* to go from home to preach thus unprepared? Not only do the text selected, and the discourse *read* from the pulpit like a schoolboy's stale exercise, not suit the subject or the occasion, but the childish, monotonous, careless manner in which the discourse is read, shows only too plainly that no pains have been taken with it! What wonder, then, that the people are disappointed and

become careless to attend the church, when they receive no instruction, nor hear anything, whether new or old, that is pleasant or profitable.

I shall here give the reader a list of some of the texts which have been lately used in different places, and let him judge for himself if these are suitable for harvest-home festivals :—Heb. iv. 9; Col. iii. 3, 4; 1 Tim. i. 15; Heb. xiii. 4; Rev. i. 7; Matt. xvi. 26; Exod. xxxiv. 3, 4; Isaiah xlv. 22; Deut. xxxii. 18; Job xi. 7, 8, 9; John iii. 16; Matt. vii. 13, 14; Micah vi. 9.

HENRICUS.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE GREAT DILEMMA; CHRIST HIS OWN WITNESS OR HIS OWN ACCUSER." By H. B. Ottley, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ilkley. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1881. Pp. xxviii., 186.

In this earnest contribution to our apologetic literature, the author casts his defence of the doctrine of our Lord's essential Deity into the form of a series of logical dilemmas, by each of which he endeavours to demonstrate that there is no alternative between accepting Christ as "very and eternal God," and rejecting Him as "that which Christian lips dare hardly frame," "an impostor of an appalling type," or at least "a fanatical and deluded blasphemer," who "deserved the criminal's and blasphemer's death which the Jews inflicted on Him." The dilemmas are these: 1. Christ claimed to be sinless; "none but God may dare to claim freedom from all sin;" He must therefore either be God, or He must have been so "guilty of self-seeking and arrogance," and His life so "honeycombed with gigantic deceptions," as to compel us to pronounce Him "worse than all men." 2. Christ claimed to be the absolute Truth. But He also claimed to be God. If, then we refuse to admit the latter claim, we are driven to condemn Him as "one who had called God to witness to a life-long fraud, intended to mislead the whole world of posterity." 3. Christ claimed, as the Messiah of prophecy, "the loftiest critical powers towards the Divine law which He revised and modified." His being Himself God could alone justify the claim; otherwise "we must start back from Him horrified and appalled; horrified, to find an impious impostor beneath the mask of a pious and majestic lawgiver; appalled, at the daring blasphemy which led Him to claim a higher position than Abraham, Moses, or Isaiah, in regard to the Jewish Scriptures." 4. Christ claimed a divine royalty. "The royalty *of God* had been the root-idea of the Jewish polity for ages." Hence, His claim must have been "blasphemous – utterly unpardonable—if it were not the natural attribute of His true Divinity." 5. Christ claimed to work miracles. If truly, He must be God; for "who save the Author of life, the Lord of nature, the omnipotent Ruler of the universe, the Lord God Jehovah, could, by the mere exercise of His authority, so concentrate into a moment the laws of the natural world as to hasten their action before the eyes of men, and thus enact physical wonders such as no science can imitate, and yet such as no science can disprove?" But if falsely, then "Christendom is built upon the necromancy of a wizard or the jugglery of an accomplished charlatan, reared, forsooth, in the carpenter's shop of a Galilean village!" 6. Christ directly claimed co-equal Godhead with His Father. If the claim was unfounded, we are thrown back on one of "the two alternatives, infatuation or imposture;" but whether He was a "blasphemous enthusiast," a "monomaniac," "a deluded fanatic," or simply "an impostor of an appalling type;" the Gospel becomes "a tissue of mingled fraud and folly," and the Christian Church "a spectral apparition, doomed for ever to be driven over the surface of a God-forsaken ocean of bewilderment."

Such are the six dilemmas, or diverse forms of the one "great dilemma," which Mr. Ottley has constructed to force the hesitating to decide between accepting Christ as the object of the highest worship, and indignantly rejecting Him as the "rightly crucified Galilean impostor." We have put them as nearly as possible in his own words; and if we do not quite accept them as satisfactory, it will be understood that what we object to is not the material out of which they are framed, but the manner in which it is employed. We heartily agree with him, that only in the doctrine of the Divine Personality of Jesus of Nazareth can an adequate explanation be found of the phenomena of the Gospels in particular, and of Christianity at large; it is his way of propounding this doctrine that we cannot help regarding with some measure of distrust.

Before giving our reasons, we must say that the book is not altogether pleasant to read. Divided into short numbered paragraphs it is jerky and spasmodic. The enormous number of quoted passages gives it a tesselated, patchworky character. The language has a forced vehemence, which is sometimes rather hysterical, and the pages are overburdened with notes and references. With regard to the quotations, whether in the text or in the notes, we could wish an increase of aptness as well as a decrease in number; they are far from being always to the point. A single illustration will show what we mean. As witnesses to the theological doctrine of the absolute sinlessness of Christ, the following four sayings are adduced from the Gospels :—"Have thou nothing to do with that just man;" "This man hath done nothing amiss;" "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood;" "I am innocent of the blood of this just person." Of course, between what the speakers of these sayings meant, and the attribute of absolute divine sinlessness, there is an enormous difference, which could scarcely be overlooked except by a young writer, over anxious to press everything into his service.

Coming now to the line of argument, we notice that it rests upon the premiss that the four Gospels give an absolutely accurate and infallible report of our Lord's words and deeds. This assumption Mr. Ottley justifies on the ground that modern sceptics have come round to concede the historical value of the Gospels, forgetting apparently that their concession falls so far short of what his argument requires, as to be accompanied by an absolute rejection of the miracles, of many of the discourses, and of considerable portions of the general narrative. The dilemmas are forcible enough as regards those who do not need them; but over those who have not got so far as to accept the Gospels in their entirety, that is, for sceptics and doubters of every shade and class, we fail to see that they can exert any logical compulsion.

Next, we greatly distrust the method of throwing the defence of the Christian faith into the form of hard and independent logical propositions. The evidences are cumulative, and they address themselves to the whole man as a rational, moral, and spiritual being,

and not to his reasoning faculty alone. If the logical demonstrations, which Mr. Ottley endeavours to construct, are really valid, in the same sense that mathematical proofs are, how is it that so many of the most acute minds of the age refuse to be convinced? If his dilemmas are logically inevitable, how is it that Unitarian theists can exist, to whom Jesus is the noblest of Teachers, yet not more than a God-inspired man?

Once more, this trenchant, kill-or-cure style of propounding the Christian faith appears to us to be repelling and dangerous. It comes to this; that every one who does not, in the strictest Trinitarian sense, believe Jesus to be "very and eternal God," is bound to regard Him with horror, and to repudiate Christianity as "a gross and blasphemous delusion," to be blotted out of the world as soon as possible. Now in the face of "the mystery of the Holy Incarnation," which lies above all human comprehension, and of the obvious fact that many minds, which are unable to accept the orthodox definitions of that mystery, do practically regard Christ as their spiritual Master, and under His teaching grow in real goodness, it seems to us plain that the attempt to shut men up to one or other of the above alternatives, is likely to contract rather than to extend the beneficial influence of Christianity, and to drive into unbelief more than it will convert to a rigid orthodoxy.

Notwithstanding our strictures, we sincerely welcome Mr. Ottley into the ranks of Christian apologists, and anticipate better things from his pen. His book shows him to have plenty of ability, vigour, and reading; and if a youthful, intellectual impatience has betrayed him into trying to settle off-hand, by hard logical thrusts and strokes, questions which belong to the sphere of the highest spiritual instincts, years and experience will doubtless improve his method without detracting from his force.

"HAGAR: or Scripture Facts concerning Marriage, especially with regard to Polygamy, Concubinage, Divorce, Marital Authority, &c." By M. D. London: Wertheimer, Lea and Co. 1881. 8vo. Pp. 206.

The appearance of this little Work at the present moment is very opportune to the discussion which has lately occupied much space in our columns; and will help at least to clear up one question which has been raised, namely, that of polygamy, to what extent it is condemned or prohibited in Holy Scripture. The author of "Hagar" comes to the conclusion that polygamy is not absolutely condemned *as a matter of principle* in any part of the Bible, Old Testament or New; though he admits that the state of monogamy may be understood in many places to be strongly *recommended* as preferable. He puts forth these views, as he says, not doubting that they will meet with a very considerable amount of opposition, but trusting nevertheless to the force of truth and straightforward arguments. "I only ask of those who object to my conclusions, first of all to show that they are erroneous, to disprove them by fair argument, before they launch out into invectives against them."

This is a fair challenge; and we shall look with interest to see it fairly taken up, and in the same logical and temperate spirit which is exhibited in these pages.

In pursuing his enquiry, the author takes us first through the various periods of Old Testament history, discussing some of the most prominent examples of polygamy. The first instance on which he dwells is that of Abraham and Hagar—a *leading case*, as he considers it. "Did Abraham do anything that was wrong, sinful, or immoral in this transaction? Did he commit an offence in the sight of God?" Some commentators of eminence, including the present Bishop of Lincoln, seem to think that he did. But after showing that no direct condemnation of the act is anywhere recorded, M. D. refers to St. Paul's exposition of the allegory of the Two Covenants, wherein Abraham's conduct in regard to Hagar is declared to have been a type of God's covenant with the Jewish Church: and if so, he asks, "Can anyone who pays the least deference to St. Paul's authority venture to say that there was anything unholy or immoral in that transaction?"

Again, in reviewing the history of Jacob, he comes to the remarkable vision at Peniel, and says:—

> So then, neither his wives nor his concubines, neither his polygamy nor his "incest," prevailed to shut him out from the most intimate communion with his God, nor to rob him of God's blessing. "He blessed him there." Not a word is said of any error that he had committed in these respects; not a word of any direction to put away his wives. No change was made after the vision in his domestic relations. . . . Again, then, I ask, if this history of Jacob is inspired, and if there is any substantial truth in that vision at Peniel, is it not a very serious thing for any man to say, in the very teeth of that record and that blessing, that either his wives or his concubines were in any way sinful, incestuous, or unholy in the sight of Almighty God?

Another point in connexion with the history of Jacob, on which this writer dwells with much force, is the fact of the Twelve Tribes being named in the Book of Revelation as representing the number of "them that were sealed."

> This shows therefore that the birth of those twelve sons of Jacob was a settled part, and an essential part, of God's grand design in the history of the world, especially of His great scheme of Redemption through the blood of the Lamb. Every one of those twelve sons was wanted to fill a place in history, or to be a type of some part of God's elect. If, then, it had ever occurred to Jacob to answer the suggestions of Laban or of Rachel with the words of Joseph, How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?—where would then have been the twelve tribes of Israel? Where would have been the sojourning in Egypt, without the birth of Joseph, and where the subsequent great typical Exodus? Where, in short, would have been either the earthly Jerusalem, or the Heavenly Jerusalem, with its twelve gates of pearl, and its twelve times twelve thousand of "them that were sealed"?

In the Mosaic Law, he shows "the system of polygamy is recognised, is in some degree regulated, and is not anywhere prohibited or condemned, otherwise than when carried to excess." One paragraph here is important in reference to a point on which some misconception seems to exist, namely, that the permission of polygamy includes also what is called "polyandry."

> It is hardly necessary to remark (he says) that the polygamy allowed in the Bible is wholly on one side. That a woman should be permitted to have two or more husbands at the same time is a thing never contemplated in Sacred History; nor, indeed, with perhaps one or two inconsiderable exceptions, in any other history that we are acquainted with. The material differences in the physical and physiological constitution of the two sexes are, perhaps, quite sufficient to account for this fact. And one consequence of some importance which follows from it is, that many laws which apply to the one sex cannot be transferred, as a matter of course, to the other. The definition of adultery, for instance,

as we have seen above, does not apply to the sexes conversely—a distinction which appears to be sometimes lost sight of in modern usage.

Without following him then at length all through his examination of the Old Testament, we may give his summary of that portion of the Sacred Volume :—

We have seen that both polygamy and concubinage were practised by many of those men whose lives are most highly distinguished in these Sacred Annals; distinguished not merely by worldly pre-eminence, but by their personal piety, faith, and communion with Almighty God : and that nowhere, in any case, were these practices rebuked or condemned by Him (except in case of excess). We have seen also that they were positively recognised and allowed in that Code of Laws which is declared to have been delivered to Moses by the Lord Jehovah.

These are the *facts of Scripture;* plain facts, without distortion, and which cannot be denied.

And these facts, taken altogether, I venture to say amount to not merely a passive, unwilling toleration of these things on the part of Almighty God—a toleration which, as we have before said, seems quite unworthy of the Divine character, as well as inconsistent with all that is related of God's dealings with mankind; but they constitute a very substantial and positive sanction; such as does not indeed necessarily imply that these are among the highest or most perfect conditions of human life, but such at least as forbids us to call them sinful, immoral, or unholy.

But after all, the great question for us is the teaching of the New Testament. Whatever may have been the permission given to these things in the earlier days, is not the whole spirit of Christianity, if not its very letter, opposed to anything like polygamy, in any shape whatever? This, no doubt, is the prevalent, almost universal feeling in the present day. That the Gospel of Christ sets before us a higher standard of holiness and purity than is apparent under the Mosaic dispensation—this obvious truth is of course clearly admitted by this writer "*as a general principle*"; but he observes, "the important question which we have here to keep in view is this, whether or not the practices now under discussion are really and definitely condemned as immoral under the laws of Christianity." And he proceeds therefore to examine in order all the passages of the New Testament which appear to have any material bearing upon the question.

First he takes Matt. xix., a chapter which by many persons is thought to contain a prohibition of polygamy. The ninth verse, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery," is carefully analysed in an argument which is too long to repeat here; but the substance of which is, that the words of Christ do *not* apply to the case of a man who does not put away his wife, but marries another in addition; and hence that they cannot be taken as a condemnation of polygamy; while to import this meaning into them "would bring us into fatal collision with the facts of the Old Testament;" that is to say, would in effect charge Abraham, Jacob, David, &c., with a life of adultery; a theory which is clearly untenable.

Another text which is often thought to forbid polygamy is St. Paul's recommendation to the Corinthians (1 Cor. vii. 2). "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." This inference, however, is here disputed, the primary object of St. Paul's advice being that every one, both man and woman, should live in the married state, not in the state of celibacy. In the disputed matter of a Bishop being the husband of one wife, he concludes also that it is "both the most reasonable interpretation, and also the one accepted by our own Church, that the Apostle here *does not* limit his choice of Bishops to those who have not married a second wife; but that he *does* limit it to those who have not more than one wife at the same time. And this, being a partial and specific limitation of polygamy, . . . shows that the practice was not abolished in the Christian community generally at that time; else what need to specify that a *Bishop* must not be a polygamist?" And he concludes the question of polygamy by saying ;—

We may think it a practice not desirable to be encouraged; we may preach against it, especially when multiplied to excess, as vigorously as against all other forms of intemperance; . . . but we cannot build a sermon upon any text of Scripture, still less can we establish a positive law on any such authority, absolutely prohibiting the practice to Christians, at all times, under all circumstances.

There are several other points of interest and importance discussed in this book—the question of Divorce and Separation, the Relative Duties of Husband and Wife, and the practice of Concubinage, as allowed by the Canons of the Early Church—on which we have not space here to follow our author in detail. But the question of Polygamy being evidently one of fundamental importance, we have thought it desirable to show our readers that, on the ground of Scriptural Authority, there is at least a good deal to be said in support of it; so much indeed, that we suspect many persons will be considerably surprised at the strength of the case here put before them. And whatever may be said about the matter as a question of social expediency—a question which this writer reserves for future discussion—for those who really have faith in the inspiration of the Bible, who believe it to be the Voice of the Living God, for such persons the verdict of Scripture must be paramount above all other considerations.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Your correspondent "Perplexed" might tell, as Mr. Haweis does ("Thoughts for the Times," p. 341), the thinking young people under his charge, that "we need not suppose ordinary days to be meant; just as when we speak of 'the present day,' we do not mean to-day, but the present age." That teaching, however, I think would be treachery to the truth, for there can be no doubt that days are meant as such in Genesis, since to each day a "morning" and an "evening" is given (see chap. i. ver. 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31); and this, together with the fact that the appointment of the seventh day of the week as the Jewish Sabbath was based upon the hallowing of that day by God, proves that "periods" and such like words which convey no idea of fixed lengths of time were not in the writer's mind. "Perplexed" may cry out that this avowal is a literal giving up of the inspiration of the Bible account of the Creation. It may be so; but is it not better to face the matter boldly and speak out honestly to our young people, than to crush their doubts by equivocation, and trust to the awful risk of never being found out?

No danger is to be more dreaded than that of a person discovering that "the spectres of his mind" in years gone by were indeed real. The shock may precipitate him into Atheism.

I assure "Perplexed" I sympathise with him deeply, for I have passed as he is passing, through the fiery ordeal of doubt. I commend for his perusal the latter part of F. W. Robertson's letter on the Book of Genesis ("Life," People's edition, p. 172), and Edward Clodd's "Childhood of Religions," which is a contribution to the solution of the question, What the young shall be taught regarding the relation of the Bible to other sacred scriptures, and to the declarations of modern science where they fail to harmonise with its statements?

BROADCHURCH.

SIR,—Your correspondent "Perplexed" appeals for a right explanation, in the face of present knowledge, of the assertion in the Fourth Commandment that "in *six* days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." As one who has passed through a similar phase of perplexity which this inquiry implies, permit me briefly to reply. My answer will endeavour to comprise other perplexities, moral as well as scientific, arising from forms of expression at variance with the standard of the present day. Our difficulties are, in a minor sense, the old difficulty of grafting Christianity on Judaism, in the time of the Saviour and His Apostles. It is again the putting of new wine into old bottles, with the accompanying evils of spilling the wine and marring the bottles. For let us be well assured that we cannot compress astronomy, geology, or indeed any of our modern sciences, into the inadequate and outworn expressions of early records, whether sacred or secular. The attempt conscientiously undertaken in a former generation by such men as Pye Smith and Professor Hitchcock, and continued by various writers down to our own day, is now found unsatisfactory; it produces two evils, for it makes the sciences say what, on examination, they do not say, and deny more and more every day, and it still leaves the impression that even when so dwarfed and mis-stated they cannot be fitted into the inadequate or contradictory statements of a bygone age. Hence our perplexity. Some have endeavoured to escape out of this unhappy condition by pooh-poohing the sciences and their professors; but as far as I can judge they have only succeeded in parading their ignorance and bigotry, while the sciences have not receded one whit from their position, but rather have advanced by giant strides, and are now advancing. This experiment naturally ended in failure. Its tendency is happily declining. Our younger clergy are themselves imbued with scientific teaching at their seats of learning, and our elder clergy are proving themselves less eager to attack the results of science. A great and I believe happy change is coming over the Church. The acquisitions of science, and even its speculations, are being adopted as magnificient lessons of providential order and design. Our last Church Congress at Newcastle compares favourably in this respect with previous ones. The learned and enlightened Bishop of Durham did not shrink from acknowledging, in his opening address in October last, that "our theological conceptions have been corrected and enlarged" by the teaching of geology, while the scare that science produced has passed away; and he bravely adds, "We admire the providential design which, through *myriads of years*, prepared the earth, by successive gradations of animal and vegetable life, for its ultimate destination as the abode of man." He even anticipates the possibility of the theory of Evolution passing into "the region of acknowledged fact." The bishop therein strikes the right cord. He suggests an answer to "Perplexed" in respect to his particular or any other similar question. It is this:—Religion adapts herself to the intellectual, moral, and scientific condition of each and every generation of men. She does not originate these conditions: she only adopts their knowledge and teaching for the purpose of furthering her own higher teaching, and complete harmony can then only be attained by a perfect assimilation of all human acquisitions in every department of knowledge. Religion is not therefore accountable for the fact that the scientific perception of last century, or of the time of Moses, is not up to the standard of the present day. Religion in no wise poses as a scientific teacher. She is not, therefore, tied down to any scientific statement in the Bible—she does not endorse it—she simply uses the current knowledge of the day to emphasize and enforce her own spiritual teaching; and this, whether that knowledge is crude, unphilosophical, or the reverse. This is the key of the difficulties "Perplexed" and others find in Scriptural statements with which subsequent knowledge is at variance. It sets science free from unworthy shackles, and it relieves believers from disingenuous and artificial interpretations. In the fourth Commandment, for instance, the recognition that science now knows of no six days, whether solar or of indefinite length, is a relief to the geologist and to the believer, who keeps the substance enjoined by the Commandment, viz., the Sabbath day.

F. T. P.

SIR,—I am much obliged to the Rev. T. G. Bonney for noticing my request, and look with interest for his next letter. Meantime I would reply to his second question by saying that I do not see any reason for considering "that the words in the Fourth Commandment rest upon higher authority than the statements in the first chapter of Genesis"; but I look on the Ten Commandments as holding a position of greater importance, owing to the circumstances under which they were given, the place they occupied in the Jewish Dispensation, and the fact that they are read in our Church services. I reply to his first inquiry underneath.

RICHARD GALBRAITH.

Carrickmacross, Ireland.

It is announced that the Rev. Sydney Hamilton Little, metropolitan organising secretary to the Additional Curates' Society, has been received with his wife and family, into the Church of Rome by the Rev. Reginald Tuke, who was also once a clergyman of the Church of England. Mr. Little who is a brother of the new Canon of Worcester, and was an Exhibitioner of Exeter College, graduated in 1872. He was ordained in the same year, and was presented by the Bishop of Winchester to the vicarage of Hordle in 1873. He was a curate of St. John the Evangelist, Waterloo Road, in 1872-4, and of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, in 1874-5. The Rev. George Whitlaw has been received into the Church of Rome by the Rev. C. H. Moore. He graduated at Christ Church in 1866, and was ordained in 1870. He was at Cuddesdon in 1869-70, and was formerly curate of Clewer.

SUPPLEMENT
TO
The Church of England Pulpit,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XII.—No. 308. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1881.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

OUR able correspondent, "An Irishwoman," requests us to point out the wrong insertion of a "not" in the top line, second column, p. 229, of her letter in our issue for Oct. 29th. This "not" seems to have expressed the inference we drew from our Lord's definition of adultery. In a former letter she had affirmed from Matt. xix. 9, that "It was the custom to put away one wife before taking another." This we denied, and are perhaps corroborated by the fact that our Saviour condemned such supposed practice by a quotation from the Old Testament in answer to a catch-question of the Pharisees. But we believe that it was the custom for rich men at that time without putting away a wife to marry another in addition, and this practice our Lord did not condemn, or rather define, as adultery. Our correspondent, like many others, seems to think it is the essence of adultery for a man to be joined to another woman while a former wife is still living and not lawfully divorced. Our Lord did not say so, or as we infer think so. If He had He would have flatly contradicted the teaching of the Old Testament to which He had appealed in this very passage; and in that case He would have condemned polygamy. If our correspondent will study our Lord's quotation from Genesis, she will see that male and female refer not to man and woman, but to "two sexes," and that they twain become physiologically as well as physically one flesh in marriage. We do not see that these words necessarily imply a law of monogamy among mankind any more than among brutes. In to-day's issue the same correspondent takes only a part and that perhaps the least important part of the definition we gave of adultery, and complains that it does not cover two supposed cases as regards the parentage of children. We would remind her that the important question is the health, mental disposition, and liability to disease of such children. The sexes in marriage literally become *one* flesh, and it is a well-known physiological fact that a first husband will influence the health and mental characteristics of children by a subsequent husband, and this subordination of the woman causes her in bearing children to contract some of the diseases, and tendencies to disease, of her husband. The sooner women recognise these facts, and are content to fulfil the glorious part assigned to them by nature as well as by revelation the better. Of course our Lord's *spiritual* definition with the limitation we indicated last week is much better than His literal one which we adopted. We may have stated in a former leader that the sexes were equally enjoined in 1 Cor. vii. 2 to marry, but we never placed them on an equality. Things essentially different cannot logically be said to be equal. In many qualities, women are superior to men, witness our correspondent's reasoning powers and argumentative skill. Inasmuch as, like a true and noble-minded woman, she is solicitous for the holiness and healthiness of "the twain in one flesh," and for the production of a strong, moral and healthy posterity, we counsel her not to disregard the means and polity by which the Jews alone of all the ancient races have endured to the present time. J. S. Mill may have been the greatest thinker and philosopher of the nineteenth century, but as a practical man and politician he is said to have been a failure in the House of Commons.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—It is stated that monogamy may be debilitating, as a proof that polygamy is no worse! The statement only shews that there are two evils to be grappled with instead of one, and it is not at all shewn that polygamy is not the greater of the two; and the writer forgets that "C. P. R." has not commended abuse of any sort. The fact that an unhallowed union may exist does not at all disprove that a hallowed union can also exist in the form of monogamy, and that such a union has been enjoined by our Lord. There is no parallel between the one case (1 Cor. vi. 16) and the other; for one refers to marriage, and is extolled, the other to shameful vice, and is abjured. The word *twain* cannot be twisted into meaning more than two. In reference to the marriage state, it meant two persons, neither more nor less. It is a quotation from Genesis in distinct reference to a man and a woman in a state of monogamy; it is therefore a marriage

law. As such Christ quotes it, as a proof that divorce is also wrong, the law being wide enough to embrace the two, and a great deal more. When Christ calls a certain act adultery, He defines the act (or acts) *not* adultery. I cannot see that your definition of adultery is correct. 1. If a woman has separated from her husband for a considerable time, and then marries another, there would be no doubt about the child's parentage, yet Christ calls it adultery. 2. If a man deliberately puts away his wife (unlawfully) and marries another, there need then be no doubt about the parentage of his child, yet Christ calls it adultery. Neither of these cases are covered by your definition. Divorce was very common in the time of our Lord. Professor Plumptre writes: "We find it maintained by the school of Hillel, a celebrated rabbi, who died shortly after the Christian era, that if the wife cook her husband's food badly she was put away. Whilst Rabbi Akibah taught: "If any sees a woman handsomer than his wife, he may put her away." The school of Shammai, however, taught only for incontinence. We could scarcely have a more comprehensive definition of adultery than our Lord's: "Whoso looketh on a woman to lust after her, committeth adultery with her already in his heart."

If I understand you aright, in a former leader you admitted the sexes were placed on equal footing (1 Cor. vii.); yet you uphold the paradox that polygamy is virtuous, and polyandry the reverse. Christ made no invidious distinctions between the sexes. His treatment of women does not shew that He thought them inferior, but the contrary. His last words were addressed to a woman, and He first appeared to a woman after His Resurrection.

"Clk." has suborned the terms, "pure and innocent," to apply them to women who, in these columns, have been denounced as infamous.

The present discussion of polygamy is not "good for the use of edifying" from three points of view, viz.: 1. As being impracticable. 2. As being an injury to the whole of mankind. 3. As being an injustice to women. It is impracticable, for the feeling of the nation against it is happily too strong to admit of its being received. It would fail to meet the evil we wish to repress. It is not men who can afford to be polygamists that are the chief promoters of it, but men who cannot afford to marry at all. In order to escape compulsory marriage, men would resort to all sorts of contrivances to prevent discovery, of the nature of the "Fruits of Philosophy," etc. General demoralisation would ensue, and I fear the last stage would be worse than the first. A one-sided view has been taken of "punitive polygamy," for some would take wilful advantage of such a law, and incur the evils complained of, in order to become polygamists. To oblige men to support the women they have seduced, would be as punitive as polygamy without its evils.

Polygamy would be entirely opposed to the principles of justice, chastity, and good government. The equality of the sexes has been advanced as a dogma by the greatest thinkers of the nineteenth century. J. S. Mill had strong convictions on the "complete equality in all legal, political, social, and domestic relations which ought to exist between men and women," and "that the consequences of the inferior position of women intertwine themselves with all the evils of existing society, and with all the difficulties of human improvement": all of which will no doubt be considered "vaporous" by "Clk." He, however, has the option of publishing a refutation of Mr. Mill's book, "The Subjection of Women"; until he is able to do that, we have to commiserate his mistiness of vision.

I would ask "Cui Bono" to shew the evil of legal interference, and to explain in plain words the cause of the failure of the Church's interference *solus*. Our Church is filled by numbers that are not doers of the Word, but hearers only. Can he explain why, to a great extent, the teaching of the Church has practically become a dead letter in our midst, and has ceased to animate our people? "Clk." truly says, "Whatever progress there may be in civilization generally, there is a *terrible deterioration going on all the while.*"

The *radical* principles of religion require to be let loose in practical working forms, so as to apply this greatest healer, morality, to all kinds of rankling sores; the main artery that supplies all the other network of veins with the principle of life. If it is altogether bound up in Church organization it will not have room to play.

As has been already said by me, public opinion is a most powerful agent for good or evil, and the law is a prime mover of that powerful factor. It would be advisable to put our heads together to draw out some definite plan of action in reducing *deterrent* laws to some practical working system, rather than to suggest impractical methods such as "punitive polygamy."

AN IRISHWOMAN.

SIR,—Your plan of relegating the social evil question to a distinct supplement is much to be commended. The Duke of Westminster's words, reported in your last, ought to carry weight. He rightly says that even the Temperance question is less important. The Guilds of the day might set down *Purity* as *in foro conscientiæ* indispensable to membership. Were they to do so, numbers might rejoice to join and have this additional aid to keeping their Baptismal vow. I question whether reform in diet has been sufficiently insisted on by your correspondents. I have urged this upon the young in a little address to soldiers, published by W. Clowes and Son, and called attention to a remarkable case mentioned among other cases by the late Dr. Parkes in his excellent manual on the "Personal Care of Health," published by the S.P.C.K., and corroborated by private information.

Nov. 7th. W. G. H.

SIR,—I am much interested in the discussion relative to the Contagious Diseases Act, which is being carried on in your very liberally edited paper. In reading the report of the Chester Diocesan Conference, in your last issue, I was much struck by a remark of the Duke of Westminster's; speaking on this subject, he said it is "the great social question of the day—far before the question of intemperance." All who have their eyes open to what is going on around them can and must endorse his words. The advocates of temperance are doing a noble work, but how? certainly not by what your correspondent "An Irish Curate" calls the system of silence. They lecture, hold meetings, preach sermons, circulate tracts on the subject. Why not do the same in a cause which is as noble, but more urgent, that of morality, chastity and health?

Let a society be formed similar to that of the Church of England Temperance Society, with a head office in

London. Let each diocese have its branch with competent officers, *men who feel deeply* on the subject. Yea! let it be deemed necessary that each parish should have a society for this object, as a recognised part of its parochial machinery.

I understand that there is a society already in existence the "Social Purity Alliance," which seems to me to be doing good work; its members number already 1,100: the principle of this society is, "that purity of life is as much binding upon men as upon women, and is a sacred universal obligation."

We deeply need such a society, but on a more extensive scale.

November 8th, 1881. J. W. A.

SIR,—I regret that the resources of the English language do not suffice to enable me, within the limits of a letter to the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, to generalise the materials at my disposal without running the risk of stating what is "simply untrue," and of being classified in the same category with those who are credited with the disposition to "spread falsehood to their hearts' content."

In my letter of October 24th, which has called forth this indignant retort from "An Inhabitant of Chatham (A Lady)," I endeavoured to throw in the lights and shades, as far as was consistent with the scope of my main argument, and I trusted to your readers' kindness to make the necessary distinctions between an Act of Parliament and the first principles of moral ethics, between State action and its modification by voluntary effort, between class legislation and its administration in exceptional cases, when—as in the parallel instance of State-aided education—the ground covered by the Acts had been, to some extent, already pre-occupied by agencies not limited by the restrictions imposed on secular administrators of the national decrees.

I took it for granted that these first principles, these axioms or premises of my argument, would be *understood* without being stated in so many words, since they were, by implication, involved in the allusions made in the context to the imprisonment of juvenile offenders, and the line of operations pursued by such voluntary agencies as the Girls' Friendly Society.

If, however, I may trespass on your space a little further, I will endeavour to throw in some of the lights and shades which present the argument to my own mind so convincingly as to lead me to marvel that my veracity should be called in question. If your correspondent will read the evidence given before the Lords' Committee by Mr. T. W. Snagge and others, she will find herself, I trust, out of regard for her own sex, disposed to withdraw her strictures upon those who are seeking to make known "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

Are we to have such an institution imported and domiciled amongst us as the French system of a "Police of Morals?" Are the constables that walk our streets by night and the private detectives that patrol them by day, to flash—metaphorically speaking—the light of Diogenes' lantern in the face of each "protected" or "unprotected" wayfarer? Or would it be agreeable to every respectable female pedestrian to read in the eyes of each civil (*i.e.*, State) guardian, in the shape of "special constables" the query "Have you duly qualified for your avocation?" if it did not actually formulate itself in the blunter phraseology of the city Arab fraternally solicitous as to the movements of the wanderer from home?

In the event of the Act being extended to the Metropolis, and the fashionable resorts of the upper ten thousand, the symbol "A. I." denoting the man of the tub and bull's eye, would represent the "State" in a capacity which would speedily elucidate another construction of the words objected to:—"The State can make no distinction in its treatment of different cases;" only the result would be that the "Acts" would not survive their extension a single Parliamentary Session, one "season" would suffice to render them so unpopular. Englishmen and women—unless they have suddenly lost some of their peculiar national characteristics—would become intolerant of such a system of espionage, they would not endure a Diogenes at the corner of every street, the centre of every market, or other place of public resort.

To the moral outcast, the man in blue is the actual representative of the State, he is the "arm of the law," and behind him looms the magistrate and the surgeon. It is from these—the civil agents of the "Acts,"—and not from the chaplain and head nurse, that the fallen derive their estimate of the standard of healthy morals inculcated by the State. Some notion of the comparative value of a good character in "the eye of the law," and therefore of those who administer its inelastic provisions, as far as its *protégées* can judge of the estimate placed thereon, may be gathered from the case mentioned—one very much in point—by Miss Bewicke. (PULPIT, p. 119, September 3rd.)

Interpret the "Act" strictly, and the blameless wife must make way for the culpable paramour. With these "Acts" the latter has to deal *compulsorily*, the moral influences alluded to by your correspondent are, on the other hand, *voluntary* in their range and operation. I repeat "material influences govern the material world, moral influences the spiritual," and this principle has reference to *houses of ill-fame*, as well as to sanitary institutions, their allies.

My argument could not take account of the action of the authorities in the voluntary wards even of a State-aided Lock Hospital, though I was well aware that the provisions of the "Acts" do not exclude voluntary operations in sanitary matters, any more than a Board School supersedes the voluntary efforts of a Parochial School Committee. Your correspondent will not find these ameliorating influences provided in the *Acts, i.e., authorised by law.* The application of such subtle distinctions as she has stated are in force at Chatham, are not *enacted* in the Act of Parliament with which I was dealing, though it may be within the discretion of the authorities, by means of *bye-laws* of *local application*, to mitigate—on behalf of "those whose first fall has thrown them into the way of being hardened in a course of sin by degrading associations"—the operation of the "malign influences" with which it is the tendency of State-legislation, pure and simple, to bring offenders into contact. The report of the Chester Diocesan Conference, which appeared in your supplement, pointed out the "inadequacy of such organisations as the Church Penitentiary Association, on its present basis, to cope with the evil," to which I would add that in view of "the appalling state of things existing in the country," the remedies to be applied must needs be carried out on a scale which the State, unaided by voluntary efforts, cannot attempt; by means of instrumentalities the Government cannot command, and on a system

which the Legislature cannot organise. If any proof of this is needed, I would refer to the statistics given in the PULPIT of October 1st, p. 166.

Nov. 8th, 1881. VERITAS.

SIR,—As I was present at the meeting held in the Guildhall, Rochester, "for women only," by the Ladies' Association for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts, mentioned by Miss A. E. N. Bewicke, I shall be glad if you will kindly allow me space to answer her. I must first explain that on the previous evening, at the meeting held by them in the Jubilee Hall, Chatham, one of the speakers accused the Lady Superintendent of the Chatham Lock Hospital of "allowing a girl to be placed in a dark cell, and fed on bread and water." This being reported to that lady by *three* persons who were present, and being utterly untrue—and, moreover, there being *no such thing as a "dark cell"* in the hospital—she made up her mind, in self-defence, to be present at the Guildhall meeting, which I must say was numerously attended; but if we subtract the very young-looking members of the Rochester Vines Congregational Young Women's Christian Society (who came there in a body) from the number, the meeting *then* could hardly be called "a crowded one." It is a sad pity, I think, such lawless speeches as that made by Miss Jesse Craigen on this occasion, who is a paid agent of the Repeal Society, and an adherent and speaker of the Land League, should be unrestrained, under cover of a "meeting for women only." Mrs. Steward, of Ongar, gave an address of an hour on the subject of the traffic of English girls going on in Belgium. Though sadly interesting in its way, it has, of course, no connection with the Contagious Diseases Acts as carried out in England, and the Lady Superintendent of the Chatham Lock Hospital begged she would not confuse the minds of her audience by associating them together, as by a subtlety of speech more clever than honest they were made to appear alike. Once or twice, when Mrs. Steward dilated on the horrors of the Belgian law, she interrupted her by informing the meeting that such things as described as taking place in Belgium could not possibly occur in this country. I heard nothing that could be called "roundly accusing" Mrs. Steward of falsehood, which Miss Bewicke says in her letter was made by a "paid official" (by whom, I presume, she refers to the Lady Superintendent), unless it may be her somewhat indignant protest at the assertion that the "spy police" (as these ladies choose to designate those acting under the Contagious Diseases Acts) "if *not bad* men could *not* be *good* ones." Whether Miss Bewicke (like her friend Miss Craigen) is a paid agent, I leave; but her reckless assertions must be met, and as a townswoman of Chatham for a life of over fifty years I *demand* of her, in our interests, *proof* of the cruelties she mentions as taking place in the Chatham Lock Hospital, as such things, *if true*, cannot be *too* searchingly inquired into, especially in the face of such revelations as have lately come to light with regard to another public institution, viz., St. Paul's Industrial School. Your correspondent, "A Surgeon," for whose manly letter we are all indebted, tells us the arrangements are excellent there; he tells us he has seen the hospital, and knows the Surgeon and Lady Superintendent, and it is noteworthy that he makes no mention of what Miss Bewicke (who has neither seen the hospital or knows either of the two people above-mentioned) has heard so much. I therefore request she will substantiate her grave charges by proofs, as we people of Chatham ought to be acquainted with cruelty going on in our midst. The "recently-appointed Chaplain" has been there a year and six months.

AN INHABITANT OF CHATHAM.

We regret that we were obliged last week to print the Rev. F. Tilney Bassett's beautiful sermon without the Author's corrections; there are numerous small errors, for which he is not responsible. On page 240, fourteenth line from bottom of first column, *read* "others" *for* "they"; and on second line from top of second column of page 241 *read* "prayer" *for* "progress." We are sorry to be obliged to hold over several papers and letters. "Amicus" would do well to consult a physician or physiologist privately. The argument he adduces from the numerical disproportion in England between the sexes of marriageable age, about 1,000,000 we believe, is a valid one, and has been urged before, but can be of course rectified by the Church promoting *female* emigration.

The Hulsean Lecturer (Rev. J. Foxley, of St. John's, Cambridge,) has announced that his lectures, which will be delivered on November 27th and following Sundays, will be on the Revelation of St. John, and that they will deal with Secularism, Scepticism, Ritualism, and Liberationism.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bone, Rev. A. Byron, vicar of Great Hormead, Buntingford Herts.
Bulkeley, Rev. A. C., vicar of Audenshaw.
Cavell, Rev. H. Theodore, vicar of Gresley; vicar of St. Paul's, Poole, Dorsetshire.
Chaytor, Rev. Charles, senior curate of Holy Trinity, Coventry; rector of St. Helen, Worcester.
Fawssett, Rev. R. A., rector of Broadstairs.
Gillum, Rev. Sidney G., rector of Pentridge, Dorset; rector of Millbrook, Beds.
Goddard, Rev. W. H., curate of North Lew; rector of East Mersea.
Humble, Rev. Emerson, rector of St. Stephen, Hulme.
Huyshe, Rev. F. J., curate of Wilton Church; vicar of Wimborne.
Read, Rev. George, vicar of St. John the Evangelist, Brents, Faversham, Kent.
Richardson, Rev. W., senior curate of Christ Church, Bradford-cum-Beswick; rector of Dorrhu, Ireland.
Scott, Rev. John Hubert, rector of All Saints', Birmingham; rector of Melcombe Regis-cum-Radipole, Weymouth.
Singer, Rev. Paulus Æmilius, rector of Swalecliffe, Kent.
Stafford, Rev. John Richard Wykeham, rector of Chalcombe, Dorset, and curate of Whitchurch Canonicorum.
Tanner, Rev. William Afric, vicar of Leysdown; vicar of St. Nicholas-at-Wade.
Truell, Rev. William Henry Augustus, rector of Iwerne-Courtnay, Dorset.
Wardroper, Rev. A. S., curate of All Saints', Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Watkins, Ven. H. W., archdeacon of Northumberland; senior curate of All Saints', Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Williams, Rev. John Alfred, vicar of Yardley Wood; vicar of Alderminster.
Wilson, Rev. Joseph Bowstead, rector of St. Helen and St. Alban, Worcester; rector of Knightwick with Doddenham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Appleton, Rev. John H., M.A., late vicar of St. Mark's, Staplefield, Sussex, at 30, St. Michael's-place, Brighton, on the 10th inst., aged 48.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CONTINUITY OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

By the Rev. J. M. WILSON, M.A., Head Master of Clifton College, Bristol, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge on Oct. 30th, 1881.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."—St. Matt. v. 17.

WHAT I wish to attempt to bring before you to-day is the continuity of religious thought, and its perpetual evolution, as a guide in the perplexities and inconsistencies of our personal religion. It is a real guide to me, and it may, therefore, be the same to some of you.

This generalization of the words of the text is fully justified by the occasion on which they were spoken. It is the real meaning of the passage expressed in modern phrase. Christ, the new Prophet and Teacher, was standing on the Mount, and all were hanging on His words. And what was He saying? and what was His life saying?

Not a syllable about what they called religion, law, and Sabbath, and temple worship, and fasts; simply the beatitudes, the inner virtues of the heart, the duty to show light. He was moving the conscience of the people by bringing them straight into the presence of their Father. He was recalling them to the consciousness of God, whom they were forgetting. His words had moved them as nothing had ever moved them before. They had felt for an instant the pressure and the nearness of God Himself. At such a moment, in presence of a higher religion, what to them were law, and ceremonial, and priest? The murmur would go round that old things had passed away; it was a new world; away with remnants of exploded superstition, and bygone forms of worship. It was to meet this inarticulate thought that Christ stopped and said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." There is to be entire continuity with the past.

It was a paradox. Here was the great Reformer speaking as an uncompromising Conservative. I need not remind you that He was a Reformer. The Christ cannot appear, the Spirit of Christ cannot reappear, except as a Reformer. The Reformation will never end. That Christ was a Reformer is the history of His life, and is familiar to us. But the less familiar aspect of His life is that He resolutely stood on old lines, and enforced the continuity of the new with the old. And the reason was that the men to whom He spoke were dreaming of a clean sweep and a fresh religious system, and He knew that these are impossible in the nature of men and things.

Now, I want you young men to study this aspect of Christ, and grasp its meaning. We, too, hear plenty about exploded superstitions, and bygone forms, and clean sweeps; and our consciences go with a good deal of what we hear, and are perplexed. We, too, like the people who gathered round Christ, have an instinct of a higher religion than that which is yet preached or practised. This higher religion is in the air. It is unformulated, unoutlined. But it is there. It is somewhere. By its silent presence it discredits much of what we preach, and most of all what we all practise. It is higher than either. It gives the uneasy sense of unreality, which is one of our great sorrows.

The apostle of this higher Christianity has not yet come; and it is very doubtful whether he will ever come; that is, it is very doubtful whether any one individual will so stand out from others as to deserve such a name. Progress is now secured by the simultaneous working of many minds. So the question for you is, How can I best be the ten-thousandth part of such an apostle myself? Your attitude cannot be simply one of negative semi-critical expectancy. That is impossible to the enthusiastic and the good. What, then, is to be your attitude? Well, I think Christ tells us. He tells us to stand on continuity with the old, but fearlessly to renovate its spirit, extracting the inner meaning and deepest truth. That is the principle, and it needs hard and clear thinking, and much courage also to reduce it to practice. I cannot stay to indicate even an outline of what I mean by the continuity and evolution of religious thought in the past. The attempt would fill a volume. You must imagine how it might be worked out. I wish you to come to the present, accepting as a historical fact the continuous evolution of religious thought in the past.

Guided by such a view of the past, what do you, young men, think would be the line taken by a great leader of the present? What would he be who would really be a tower of strength to you and to your generation? It is worth considering, because what you can distinctly picture to yourself as great in another, you can to some extent realise in yourself. If you can say "That is the man we want," then, my friend, God is saying to you "Be that man." You cannot be all you *dream*, because you will perhaps dream that you will be a *great* leader, a *great* writer, a *great* preacher, and leave a mark on your age. When you are forty you will find that not so easy. But nevertheless you can be that man. Whatever you can distinctly conceive

you can do, and you can leave it to God to decide on what scale it shall be done.

The first thought that will occur to many of you will be, I suppose, that the new Reformer will be very unlike our modern parson: you picture him scorning human traditions and petty *convenances*, and incurring hatred, at any rate, from the Scribes and Pharisees of the day, and perhaps from everybody: you picture him gathering in the poor, not standing in his cassock and surplice and repeating his "Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us in sundry places," but by the words and looks of a man speaking to dying men. You picture him as much more Christlike; shall I say, you picture him as much more honest than us parsons. All this you may picture to yourself, and I to myself. It is good for us to do so, very good.

But I ask you also to remember, as a certain consequence of the law of evolution and continuity, a law which I believe, and probably you are beginning to believe, is universal, a law of thoughts as well as a law of matter and life, a law to which in a certain sense Christianity itself forms no exception—I ask you to remember, first, that the standard of the morality and spirituality of your ideal Reformer will rise and not fall. It will alter in form. But the standard will not fall. How he will search the complications of modern life; how he will add new territories to the kingdom of duty. Assuredly men will not listen long to anyone who waters down or unduly limits the demands of duty. The religion of self-culture, that would remove all unpleasantness as "marring its calm," may amuse a few unhappy minds and will do them some harm, but it will not satisfy them. Your Reformer is not one who will only keep up as much as is decent, He will pitch his demand very high.

And further, I beg you to note—for this is the principal thought that the text suggests—there will be no new departure. All will be continuous with the old. Irrelevances, temporary scaffolding, will be discarded, but his leading principles will, be evolved out of the past. For religious thought is the growth of the human soul, the soul of the colossal man; the world and this growth cannot be reversed. A mere logical conclusion may be upset by finding a premiss wrong or incomplete; a philosophical theory may be reversed by further knowledge, but not the growth of the human soul. If there is anything to be learnt from history it is this. Nothing is more certain than that the highest religion of the future, what I have called higher Christianity, will be evolved out of the highest thought of the present; and the highest thought of the present is the Christian theory and religion, as even heathens admit. It is vain to hope that progress will be secured by going back to pre-Christian principles of Ethics. This is the lesson of the past, and the guide to your future. This is the continuity I spoke of. The true reformer—and each of you who wishes to be the ten-thousandth part of a true reformer will do what Christ did—selects his vital forces among the best of the present.

The confidence that the new will somehow rise out of the old is the greatest comfort that a thoughtful but unsettled mind can have. It justifies the attitude of expectancy and waiting for light; it justifies the patient clinging to the past till things clear up, with the incessant endeavour to understand and adapt it; it welcomes the critical spirit of the day, for this confidence uses that spirit and is not alarmed at it; it welcomes all scepticism, that is rightly called scepticism, as assisting in the evolution of the higher Christianity; above all, it welcomes all advance in spirituality wherever seen, all quickening of the public conscience, all increased love of truth, and of sacrifice for it.

But let us look closer. Is further evolution possible? Is it possible to get at the very central truths, to bring them out and proclaim them, and carry men's consciences with you? We know that there is a chord ready to vibrate in every heart if we can but strike the right note. All men are religious. There is not one of you, not a man whom you meet in the street, who is indifferent to the great problem of life. You may despair of getting at any solid ground below the tons of rubbish carted on the soil; but he who could show you that solid ground would be your best friend; and we know it is there. Can we find it? Surely my friends it is not hard to find. Surely the one essential thing in religion, to which we want to get back, is to care much and to care always for doing our duty. This is what Christ, at any rate, taught us, by word and life. He that doeth God's will is alone to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Mercy, and not sacrifice, is what God desires. To learn our duty and to do it is the beginning and end of all religion. This, I believe, your new reformer will say very plainly. He will go on to say that the great moral dynamic, that which impels men to learn and love, and do their duty, is the consciousness of God. This consciousness of God as a reality, as a Father, as in some sense present with us, is given to all men. But it was infinitely quickened by Christ. Go back to the Gospels once more, and see whether this is not the chief lesson we gather from them. Is it not the very secret of their power? See what a stern, sobering, moving power it has in its simplicity? See how our Lord's Prayer is full of this simple consciousness of God? "Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." It brings us straight into His presence. Now, in very truth, this consciousness of God is in danger of falling out of our religion; or being buried under it. Partly because we have outgrown some of the earlier forms in which this consciousness of God expressed itself in man. It assumes different forms, according to some evolutionary law,

in the savage, the Jew, the educated heathen, the early Christian, the Roman Catholic, the Protestant, the nineteenth-century Christian. But we cannot believe that it will vanish. The ages, of course, overlap. We could find in Cambridge, perhaps in this congregation, nearly all these ages; and the teacher must speak a language which will be understood, and even though the form is no longer the one most suited to himself. It is no hypocrisy in us to speak of God talking to Abraham. It is the form which the consciousness of God then required; and the form in which our children and peasants still require it. But whatever the form we use, let us see that we have the reality.

We are in danger of losing this thought partly also because our so-called religious world strays away on this side, as the less religious world does on the other. They seem to shrink from its sternness. They forget the lesson in the teacher. They forget the lesson in the helps to the lesson. There is a danger of getting into a more highly strung and effeminate religious atmosphere. But nothing will replace the consciousness of God that Christ gave us, as a power to help us to do our duty.

A second great lesson Christ gave to the world, and that was good will to man. As a principle it follows from the first. If you keep God before you, love to man is not far off. But in the form in which He gave it, it adapts itself better to rules of conduct.

I think, therefore, that our great preacher would throw his teaching into the same perspective that Christ did, and yet once more these two great principles would stand out before all others, and would carry with them their own motive force. He would strive to preach duty, based on consciousness of God and love to man, and all secondary aids he would hold lightly, and use or discard as he found expedient, even as Christ Himself did.

Yes, you say, and if this were religion I could be religious; indeed, I am so. But what do you mean by calling this religion? What of our churches and creeds, and doctrines, and articles, and all our theology? If duty based on consciousness of God and love to man be religion, what are all these? I will answer. They are or have been helps, that some of us find, or others have found, necessary or useful to religion. But religion they are not. They are the defensive armour in which religion has clothed itself, but they are not the living force within. They are the weapons which have been and are used against the foes of religion that exist in our own nature. But such defensive armour may crush the wearer; and such weapons may be in some battles as useless as bows and arrows against steel plates. We must not worship even sacred armour. No, though religion will never be independent of them, they are not religion.

O my friends, we want to get back to religion once more. Instead of insisting that everyone shall use our nostrum, our bows and arrows, let us get back to the simplicity of it. Let us keep the end in view, and not distrust those who by any means attain the end. If one of your friends lives in a holy peace of mind, and in the purity of heart that marks him who is conscious of God's presence? if he is unselfish and full of goodwill to others; if his memory and look restrains others from sin, and cheers them when fallen; ask him his secret; whatever is essential in religion he has.

We must keep Christ in our heart, the preacher says. Why? Surely because He brings to us, as nothing else does, the consciousness of God, and love to our fellows. For does He not bring God nearer us and make Him more conceivable? Do we not, as we read of Christ, seem to know our Father, as we know Him in no other way? Do not our hearts almost burn within us? Has He not also raised all mankind in our eyes? Not a poor outcast boy or a girl in the streets but mutely appeals to us in the image of Christ. This assuredly is why we must keep Christ in our hearts. He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father.

But we need, all of us, help to use even the help of Christ. We forget Him. Here in a sacred building, in a quiet half-hour, we can remember Him, but not always.

Is it so? Then this is the use of sacred buildings and quiet half-hours, and of all the apparatus of Church-worship, and clergy, and of all the devotional books that ever were written, and of all the sermons that ever were preached, to give us the consciousness of God, and the love of man, chiefly but not exclusively through the knowledge of Christ, and thus inspire us to do our duty. This is religion, and this is what you and I alike impatiently want to get back to. What would Christ Himself say to us in this church, if that Sacred Form we have so often pictured to ourselves could speak to us? Which of us can tell? He denounced the use of the Sabbath when on earth, and the far-fetched teaching of Pharisee and Scribe. How would He treat our teaching? How would he treat the so-called Voice of the Church? One thing we may be sure of—not one jot or tittle of His high demands would be abated. His words would still be, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

I think—it forms the working hypothesis of some lives now, lives that are neither unhappy nor useless—that He would say: Use all the help you can, as you find best: help of worship and prayer and sacraments: but do not pin your faith on *them*, pin your faith on *God*. Nay, if it help others for you to use those helps, if it show sympathy with them, though you use them somewhat differently, still use them. You may do so

with entire honesty. By the side of one who receives the consecrated elements with the belief that they are the very Body and Blood of Christ, may kneel one who believes that they are but bread and wine, and that his act is commemoration only. Both alike aim at keeping Christ in their hearts, as a help to doing their duty. Keep your eye, He would surely say, keep your eye on the end and aim, not on the means your neighbour uses. Look even through Christ at the Father. Look even through Christ at your fellow-men. God and your fellow-men are the ultimate aim of all religion.

And then, O fellow Christians, fellow men, where is our reluctance to work for such a cause? Where our timidity in dealing with Church questions? Where the quarrels and jealousies of good men? Where our shameful idleness and unpatriotism? Into what limbo of shadowy unrealities have gone most of our discussions? Fill your heart with the cause, the noblest of all: duty done in consciousness of God and love to man, and the perfection of religion is once more plain—even as Christ made it plain.

If we, O my brother clergy, and if you young men who look forward to this grandest, and most honourable, and now most difficult of services for your country, if all of you faithful and loyal spirits could but grasp the religion that Christ taught, duty and the love of God and man, what might we not do even before the century is out? The people cry aloud for religion, for the true genuine thing. Let us show them the true and lasting religion that lies below our forms and once inspired them, holding our forms loosely, but our aims firmly, nay fiercely. You may be high or low, or broad as they say—all are alike as far as they are in earnest—all can unite in the civilising work of their office; all in the moral aim of teaching men to know and love and do their duty; all in trying to recall the consciousness of God and love of man; all can unite in believing that this is best done by preaching Christ, and by living holy, simple, unworldly lives. Some may, however, be listening to me, or may subsequently read these words, who may in all honesty think that to use even these helps would be disloyal to the sacred name of Truth. Shall I, you may say, repeat a creed I do not believe; pray to a God who, I believe, does not hear; talk of a Christ who is, I believe, only a devout imagination? What question is more searching? I bid you descend into yourself, and find out what your religion is, what your aim is. If it is a low aim, comfort, wealth, reputation, if it centres on self, give it up. It is joyless, useless; it will bring you weariness and self contempt. If it is a high aim, then sooner or later in pursuit of duty God and love will fill your heart, and you will find that you too are a Christian. The path of duty will assuredly lead you to God and to love.

But I adjure you by all that is honourable, by truth itself, that you do not take from others their hope and their help. If you are independent of their aids to a life of duty, live that life yourself, so as to be an example to all of purity and high-mindedness, and live it in silence. Remember the words of Matthew Arnold:

> "Scorn ye this world, their tears, their inward cares?"
> I say unto you, see that *your* souls live
> A deeper life than theirs.
> Say ye "The Spirit of man has found new roads,
> And we must leave the old faiths and walk therein?"
> Leave there the Cross as ye have left carved gods,
> But guard the fire within.

Or listen to the grand words of a greater than Matthew Arnold, words that we heard read in this morning's lesson. "Seemeth it," said the prophet to the sceptics of his day, "seemeth it a small thing to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures? and to have drunk of the deep waters, but ye must foul the residue with your feet? And as for my flock, they eat that which ye have trodden down with your feet: and they drink that which ye have fouled with your feet." Is this a worthy use of your peculiar advantages of education, that you will foul with your feet the pastures and the deep waters which refresh the souls of others?

To effect one more step in this evolution of the new out of the old is the work of your generation. What nobler end and aim in life can you set before you? Where else can you better be trained for such a work? Cambridge is the inheritor of this true, tenacious, wise and liberal conservatism. She is the child of the ancient learning, and the mother of the new; she inherits the traditions of calmness and wisdom, and continuity and industry. If anywhere, it will be here, in this thoughtful and restful home, that wise and strong men will be trained who will do this work for their country. Her sons are already doing this work, in many a field of honest labour, from Durham to Truro. Carry on their work. Fill old forms with new life. As you use them they will grow more and more a help to you. But keep in your heart and in your teaching, whether of life or word, as cleric or lay, the aim ever in view, duty in consciousness of God and love to man, and fear not that you will some day find, as many another has found in the pursuit of duty, that Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has forwarded a donation to the funds of the Working Men's Club and Institute Union, accompanied by an expression of his warm sympathy with its objects.

The Premier's private secretary has written to a correspondent at Middleton:—"Mr. Gladstone desires me to inform you that he never, to his knowledge, called the Public Worship Regulation Act unconstitutional. His disapproval, however, of the measure as an unwise one is on record in the debates of Parliament."

ALL SAINTS' DAY.

By the Rev. W. B. PHILPOT, M.A., Vicar of South Bersted, Sussex.

Sermon Preached at South Bersted.

"Such honour have all His saints."—Ps. cxlix. 9.

I WILL ask you, brethren beloved in the Lord, to heighten the tone of your feelings, to add proper dignity to the sense of your position, and to lift your lives, by dwelling on those great thoughts, which by the order of the year are brought before us to-day: for are we not called upon to celebrate the Day of All the Saints?

How can it be imagined that any of you can be wholly unmoved by so great a consideration as this? Think with me only for a little space this morning on the delightful advantage of belonging to so great a Company.

Take some of the ideas with which, as life passes, we are some of us wont, it may be, to make ourselves more familiar.

You count it a grand thing in its way, if you can reckon a long line of lofty ancestry. You hold it to be a high honour, as the world counts honour, to belong to a family that bears the name and wears the arms of some historic hero, handed down through generations of the brave; and, if you do not disgrace the name, much more if you grace it, this may well be deemed by you a very signal honour. You take a just pride in forming one of the complement of a great ship, or in belonging to some famous corps. You are conscious of a thrill of deep emotion and high self-sacrifice, if you march to battle under colours scorched and rent in victorious onsets, through which your regiment has triumphantly borne them. You regard all such fellowship as great, and you are penetrated with a sense of genuine manhood, when you call up to your minds in what communion you are moving.

You look upon it again as a fine thing, and so it is, to stand as an honoured name on the roll-call of some great public school; or on the books of some ancient college or institution of high repute. You are not insensible to a certain *esprit-de-corps*—if I knew any English expression for this I would use it—when you are attached to some princely firm of unimpeachable mercantile credit; or if you, as your fathers before you, have a holding in the rent-roll of some ancestral tenantry—and many other such companies I might name:—and *that*, although these, however great they now may be, are most of them, as we know too well, subject, in the course of human affairs, to sweeping and disgraceful changes; nay, although all of them, sooner or later, are sure to perish and be forgotten.

You are proud, I say, nor wholly without reason, if you belong to any one of such bodies as I have named. To an honourable mind, a mind bent, not so much on giving and bearing away private credit from the company to which he may belong, as upon doing his part to maintain the dignity which he inherits or the honour which he shares, and to shed upon it still brighter lustre—to such a mind the feeling to which I allude is a natural and a wholesome one. Yea, though it may seem to involve the paradox of a becoming selfishness, that feeling, when drawn out towards our mother-country, is at the root of patriotism itself, which is beyond controversy all but the most manly principle there is, and only short of the highest that we know. But what are we to say of this body of persons in whose company I call you to-day to remember that you are enrolled? The Army of the Living God? The Regiment which is Christ's Own? The Club, the Firm, the Family of the Holy and undivided Trinity? In a word, the Communion of All the Saints?

Think not that I am now speaking in the clouds, or that I have got among unreal natures; for I beg you to mark that I am telling you of the most actual, the most honourable, the most worshipful of all mortal or immortal Corporations. What are we to say of our belonging to such a company, limited in a sense in respect of our own private and personal responsibility, but unlimited in the credit that it imparts to us, the splendour that it pours on us, and the glory which it promises to reveal, in the holders of its shares and of its debenture-stock, both here and when this world is done?

And yet, as for the *word* "saint," the Adversary, among his thousand devices, has, by a piece of mastercraft, managed, strange to say, in some weak and worldly minds to cast a certain ghastly slur upon it; so that it has even become on loose lips a term of mockery; as though it befitted only the long drawn grimace of the false religionist, or the nasal whine of the canting hypocrite; as though it were a title wherewith to brand either the fictions of a knave, or the drivellings of a fool; as though in short this highest name in all humanity were a grotesque appellation of mere poltroonery, and were not at all descriptive of a man!

It is possible, indeed, that some false men, because they were *no* saints, have sometimes, in their own unhappy case, given colour for such an abuse of this great word; but it has, I repeat, been a prime device of the Devil, and we are not ignorant of it, to call such people saints at all. It did not answer his dark purpose that these should be called by their proper names of hypocrites and knaves; for then possibly for very shame they would themselves have dropped their knaveries and hypocrisies, and the whole body of *real* saints (to whom for interested motives, they had attached themselves) would so have stood clear and unattainted by their reproach; and that would ill have suited the object of one whom our Divine Friend calls "an Enemy." It matched better, you see,

his fell design to drag down, if he could contrive to do so, all the saints to the level of these false brethren by turning the very word "saint" itself into a term of reproach, and a brand and token of contempt. It would not have carried out the aim of the power of darkness to leave the splendid title of "Saint" to be the unsullied addition of the people of God. But nevertheless—nay, all the more—in the Heraldry of the Church of Christ, in the office of the Church of England, it remains to you a name untarnished by time; and thus, in pious memory and buoyant hope, we thankfully acknowledge to-day that we belong, unworthy as we are, to the Communion of Saints.

Do I say *we* claim to belong to it? Aye, *we*—however humble, however young, however small and of no reputation, we may be—yet, I tell you, *we* belong to that Guild, and have a vested stake in its best blessings. "Such honour have all His Saints."

Tell that puny boy, so soon as ever he is able to apprehend anything of the blessing of being one among a happy number—and that is after all about the utmost range of all that the wisest of us can as yet take in—tell that little frail child, girl or boy, whose intellect is the dullest in the school, who stands the last in the class, but who is *doing his best* to please his parents, his master, his minister, and his God—tell him or tell her, for you will tell them truly, that he is wearing upon his brow the cross of his Redeemer's Order, and the seal of the Living God; that he is held in great account where alone it greatly imports that he should be accounted of; tell them that the Church of God and of England regard them as members of Christ, as children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. Tell your sweet children that they each have a whole share and a perfect part in the honours of the Day of All the Saints.

Yes indeed, you may say, good children who are brought to Christ, we *know* share this honour; for has not Christ Himself said "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven"?

Nay, but what honest Christian does not share it likewise? Or is it that this is an honour for Emperors, Kings, and the rich? Is it indeed, that for statesmen, philosophers, poets, the teachers of men, the leaders of science, and for authorities in theology, reserved seats are kept at this Feast of all the Saints? For them certainly this is an open honour, and the highest which they can aim at or hope ever to attain—an honour, before which all honour that may come to them from men pales and fades in the comparison. Though with the cable of earthly eminence it may be found to be hard to thread the needle's eye of the gate of heaven, yet when—by the help of Him with whom all things are possible—men can once manage to thread this divine needle, then temporal greatness is no more an obstacle to shut you out from the portals of Paradise than it is a passport to let you into them.

The title for admission, the qualification for membership in this world-wide Society is drawn up and couched in terms so broad, so high, so deep, so grand, that all the many tests which men have sought out to replace it, are mean and pitiful indeed.

The fact of being made at first in the image of God, and then becoming a new creature in Christ Jesus—this is the watchword, this the wedding-garment which passes you into that Banquet Hall, where the King holds high festival for all His Saints. Yes, you good Christian souls, who, amidst all the struggles and vicissitudes of your varied fortunes, over all the ups and downs of your daily life, go forth to your work, and your labour till the evening—you who guide or carry out the courses and duties of the natural year—who, by grace of God, cause the earth to bring forth her increase and supply the world with bread—you, before whose steady eye and firm hand the plough, by horse or steam, clears the ground, and the seed falls into it—before whose steady stroke the woods bend and the great trees fall—yea, even you, by whose weather-beaten parish-paid work the very roads on which we go to and fro become harder and higher, and fitter for the uses of traffic and travel—you, by whose graceful skill these hedges that "honour the holy bounds of property" come to look so trim and cared for, while the waste waters of the well-drained uplands keep only the courses you make for them—yes, you, I say, every one of you, with your wives and children, have a cover laid for you at this High Festival of all the Saints.

Let us try for a few moments to contemplate and realise this Company, both in itself, and by way of contrast with another company, a company which is set over against this as its awful correlative and its corresponding term in the ratios of Eternity. And to this end how can we do better than take our keynote from that ancestral hymn which your children and your choir just now so sweetly sang?

For what sang they? "We praise Thee, O God, we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord. All the Earth doth worship Thee, the Father everlasting." Who are they that thus lift up their praises? *We and all the earth.* There you have one branch of the Company, and it is the branch of it best known to us as yet. We mount higher in recounting the grades and orders of the Saints. "To Thee all angels cry aloud, the heavens and all the powers therein." Break up the heavens again, and scan those ranks of which we can now but dimly forth-image the being and shadow out their offices, knowing, as we do, their very names but faintly, and but as falling echoes of some world of which men once indeed, it would seem, knew somewhat more than now—if indeed, before Christ came, this by some mysterious foretaste so could be.

There are the Cherubim with their light of lofty

knowledge, and the Seraphim, with the burning glow of their immortal love. Having thus soared to the highest we can hear of, and caught what names can be named in heaven—though still only of such beings as star the verge of the vision of things not fully to be conceived nor lawfully to be uttered —that galaxy of undeciphered light, whose rays have not yet reached us—leaving these, the Hymn, as though its wings were out-wearied with ascent, hovers down to earth again—at least to those earthly memories which are her personal treasure gone before and laid up in Heaven by the Church.

"Heaven and earth are full of the Majesty of Thy Glory. The glorious company of the Apostles praise Thee. The goodly fellowship of the Prophets praise Thee. The noble Army of Martyrs praise Thee"—as though in all these the praises of heaven and earth were blended, making up full concord to the angelic symphony—their memories left on the earth, their spirits made perfect in Heaven.

And lest any of you be left out in the cold, omitted or forgotten, this hymn, in its Catholic sweep, wakes up to join in its praises, "the holy Church throughout *all the world;*" which is to say, throughout not this planet only, but if in any other realm, or region, star or asteroid there be any created souls, redeemed or unfallen, any lives capable of hymns, belonging to the domain of God.

Now I pray you to take note that all this is in the words, not of one man's vague fancy, but of the soberest, wisest, most cautious Church there is—a Church from which some have been runagates because forsooth the language of our public worship seemed inadequate to the warmth of their private conceptions! Such are the breathings of our *Te Deum*, sent up through long ages, held to by the Church of God while many dark and foolish ways clave to her, but reverently preserved by her still, when, on her resurrection to a wiser and nobler life, she cast the worser part of her old superstitions to the winds.

I have thus given you—not, I repeat, in my own language, but in the best I could anywhere find—the catalogue and programme of the personages who, in this supreme Legion of Heaven's own Honour, make up the goodly array of the Communion of all the Saints. Great God! can it, I ask, be possible that any of us here to-day will be indifferent as to whether we belong, or do not belong, to such a Society as this? Have you any ambition in you? Here, indeed, is a range for it —the best crown to which the only right ambition leads. Have you any gift of imagination? Here, if anywhere, is a legitimate scope for it. Have you any taste for divinity? any spiritual intellect for pondering with pious calculation on the fitnesses of eternal verities? any music in your soul for unravelling the harmonies of the purest Truth? Here is an infinite field for all the highest powers you have, in which to find their purpose and their play. Have you anything of our human faculty of Faith, by which you may revel with delight in the regions of lofty instinct, and infallible intuition of the things which are higher than proof? Have you, lastly, any genuine capacity of immortal Love, so as to enjoy with pure eye the sight of God, and those visions of supernal and eternal beauty, and so as to find an expressive relish in the practice of loving-kindness? Well: here is a range below, prophetic of infinite ranges above; *here*, I say, in the Communion of all the Saints—for the Master says: "Inasmuch as ye are kind to one of the least of these My brethren, one of the least of all the Saints, ye do it unto Me." This is the path by which alone you can "rise in the world," if indeed your aim be that—the only world, believe me, worth your rising in. If not—mark my words—you must *sink* in the world—down, down, down—for time and for eternity—sink in this world, sink in *that* world.

For I spoke of another company. It is the communion of all the sinners! A day is coming which will be the counterpart of this. That will be "All Sinners' Day": for all power in heaven and earth is given to the President of our Society, to Him who is, and already in all civilised societies is acknowledged to be, the Judge of all mankind. The King will say to His servants, "Gather out of My Kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth." A terrible converse to this day of All the Saints will be that day of all the sinners; for "Cast the bad away" are the words of the Master. "Bind him hand and foot and cast him into outer darkness," says He who casts out none that come to Him. My brethren, glance through the things which were told to St. John, and you will find some awful revelations about that fiery communion of the damned. Is not everything that makes life miserable—*sin?* Is not everything that makes life happy—*Christian goodness?* In that great refining process, by which sin will be precipitated and the salt of the earth left pure, it is clear that those who take their part with the bad will leave the good happier by their absence; and will themselves be made more wretched by the absence of all in them and around them that was good. For the reason why the bad are not as yet wholly wretched is only that there are roots of goodness in them still; and because a merciful, long-suffering Father prolongs to them the power of choice, and holds out to them a hope that they may yet make that choice aright. Moreover, at least in a nation like this, sinners cannot choose but enjoy the surrounding gleams of the very communion for which they affect contempt. But a day is coming when the "sweet Master" and only Saviour will, perforce and by all the necessary laws of moral judgment, bid the ministers of divine penalty to "Cast the bad away." What becomes of *them* it concerns us not, on this bright festival of ours, further to ask;

but let us take heed to ourselves lest, haply, a promise being left of entering into His rest, any one of you should seem to have come short of it. In the words of him who wrote to the Hebrews, "Seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset us"—for *that* surely it is which debars men from the sweet and bright companionship of the Saints, and plunges them into that bitter, black, and tragical society of the lost—"looking unto Jesus, the Author and Perfecter, the Alpha and Omega of our Faith"—who, "being dowered with the scorn of scorn, the hate of hate, the love of love"—"for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the Throne of God"—that right hand where His people shall reign with Him when the world is over and past. "*Such honour have all His saints.*"

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1881.

DISESTABLISHMENT AND COMPREHENSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By the Rev. F. BRISBANE BUTLER, M.A., Assistant-Master in Haileybury College.

Paper Read at a Meeting of Clergy of the Ware Rural Deanery, held at Great Amwell Vicarage.

It will hardly be denied that to those who are lovers of the Church of England, and not lovers of change, the signs of the times give cause for grave anxiety. Occasionally those who wish to blind us, or who themselves may prefer blindness, tell us that the cry of "the Church in danger" has lasted as long as the Church itself, and has always been as unreasonable, and turned out as untrue, as the intermittent panics of a French invasion. In one sense, it is true that the Church has always been in danger. It is its privilege to be at enmity with the world, and if it were not so it would not be faithful to its Master. But the sense in which the cry, "The Church is in danger" was first most loudly heard, about the time of Queen Anne, was a different sense from this. It was held at the time by most Churchmen and the greater part of the nation that the Protestant establishment was the chief bulwark of English liberty against the old bugbears which so strongly haunted then the British mind, Popery on the one hand, and Puritan fanaticism on the other. It was held that any increased toleration of Dissenters would be a serious danger to the Established Church, and consequently to the established civil government. Dissenters were then not popular, and when the Tories raised the cry of "The Church is in danger," the mob was sure to rally to the rescue. It is obvious that the same cry would not arouse popular enthusiasm now, but it may nevertheless be raised with greater truth.

I do not, however, purpose to treat the subjects of my paper, "Disestablishment and Comprehension," as unmixed dangers, but rather as possible changes involving possible good as well as evil. Both changes have already made some advance.

We are well aware that "Disestablishment" is a misleading and inexact expression. But we understand that it involves two things; firstly, placing the Church in the same relation to the law as all the sects; and secondly, disendowment. This last word would also appear to be inexact, if we take the precedent of the Irish Church. For that body was deprived of the ancient endowments, which were not given by the State, and received instead, for the first time, a sum of money, which was. This was called disendowment, whereas it really seems to be a new form of endowment. It was not a State-paid Church before, and it is now, though not so well paid. But at all events, we know that the change which our neighbours suffered, and which may be in store for us, would involve well-nigh the destruction of our parochial system, and the loss of the ancient tithes and glebes. Towards this consummation one important step has been already taken: the number of the bishops having seats in the House of Lords has ceased to correspond with the whole number of bishops having sees; quite without reason being assigned, but obviously in deference to strong party influences—quite contrary to constitutional precedent, but apparently with the full approval of most of the clergy and faithful laity. A more threatening sign is the open war between the authorities of the Church as at present constituted and a very active party in the Church, which meets with increasing support in this question from many churchmen outside its immediate adherents. Unless this breach is healed, it seems quite likely that Parliament, urged by interested advisers in the press, may resolve to break off the connection altogether.

Perhaps the imminence of comprehension may not seem so probable, but there is no doubt that the Evangelical and Latitudinarian parties have strong tendencies in the direction of overthrowing all marks of distinction between the Church and Protestant Dissent. It is said that some churchmen who value establishment more than Church principles aim at comprehension as a safeguard from disestablishment. I have even been told that a Society has been formed for forwarding this object, but its work, if actively, does not appear to be very publicly carried on. It is this idea, however, which has chiefly suggested to me the juxtaposition of the two possible changes, disestablishment and comprehension, and on the whole I am inclined to think that there is more to be feared from the latter, as I shall try to show. We are in a difficulty from not having before us any definite scheme for union with Dissenters, but it might not be impossible to conjecture the main outlines of such a scheme from what is known of the views of its projectors. I have implied that this change, like the other, has also to some extent cast its shadow before. The extraordinary and unique prevalence of the most opposite opinions within the Church, continually coming out into fresh prominence, may fairly suggest to some minds

that still further comprehension would sacrifice no principle and involve no danger.

Before investigating this point, let me for a moment recall the chief historical crises through which the Church has passed already. Both disestablishment and comprehension have already been tried, and we may learn something from the results, even if the lesson is merely that the circumstances of the past were so different from the present, that nothing can be inferred at all. I suppose the only precedent for disestablishment was in the dark days of the Civil War. There were times under Cromwell when it seemed as if the Episcopal Church of England must die out. There was no attempt to fill up the vacant sees. The parochial system was not abolished, but ignorant mechanics often filled the pulpits and drew the revenues. The Prayer-book was forbidden by the law, though the Government of Cromwell connived at its secret use. The boasted toleration of the Independents shewed little mercy to the Church of England and none whatever to the Church of Rome. If the Monarchy had not been restored, the Church must have perished. But the tradition of English freedom and English order, when opportunity came, threw off the yoke of military fanatics, and Church and King came back together. It is plain that these well-known events offer little instruction for ourselves. It is unlikely that disestablishment now would involve immediate persecution, whatever may be in store for the Church and for all religion if ever an intolerant unbelief should gain the power in this country for which it is diligently striving. It is also most unlikely that if disestablished, any political changes would again restore the Church to her legal status and possessions. We can only learn from our ancestors of that day the great lesson of patience, and of the purifying results of temporal adversity. It would be chimerical, however, to expect that any adversity can ever bring us again such divines as Pearson, Taylor, Usher, and Bull.

On the question of comprehension, more may be learnt from the past. It has been the burning question of the Church of England ever since her separation from the Roman See. When the headlong Protestantism of the ministers of Edward VI., and the thoroughgoing Popery of Mary, had alike failed to win the acceptance of the nation, the politic councillors of Elizabeth established their famous compromise. The great body, both of clergy and people, were then on the whole attached to the old religious forms, while an earnest and increasing party was against every shred of ceremony. In out of the way places, vestments continued to be worn for some time till they were worn out, and no one would pay for new ones; and under the shadow of some old hall, the mass priest would not unfrequently escape the vigilance of the Government, and celebrate the old rites. The object of the Council was to conciliate the great body of the people, without treating with the new religious teachers. The rubric retained the vestments, while the Bishops were ordered only to enforce the surplice. It was hoped that by such measures Church and Nation would be coextensive. But events and the passions of men soon defeated this plan of comprehension. The Puritan party became more and more zealous and unaccommodating, and the majority of the people swung round to their side. The Pope's Bull and the King of Spain's plots, stirred up the patriotic indignation of the English people, and made them more ready to listen to the Pope's irreconcileable enemies, the Puritan preachers. By the end of Elizabeth's reign the House of Commons had become strictly Puritan. The old moderate Catholic sentiments had nearly everywhere died out, and persecution had hardened the Romanist minority, mostly to be found among the old county families, into a band of eager sectarians. The compromise had failed. The two parties were further apart than ever, and one of them nearly monopolized the Church. Statesmen may think to include in one body parties of diametrically opposing principles, but the result may be only to accentuate the differences and perpetuate the opposition. Wide as the statesman's net may be there are sure to be some too conscientious or ardent spirits that will escape him Then he must sacrifice his plan or persecute; a religious heresy becomes an offence against the law. The sagacious and tolerant men who planned a comprehensive Church of England found themselves in a few years as habitual and relentless persecutors as any inquisitor or fanatic. The compromise had failed, and we may still doubt whether any attempt to make men swallow vital differences deserves to do otherwise than fail.

But, meanwhile, the incessant controversies in which the Church, by its anomalous position, found itself engaged, produced a learned clergy, unsurpassed perhaps in any age or country, who established the Church, which they defended on a very strong basis, in argument, if not in fact. The attacks of the Puritans produced Hooker. The attacks of the Romanists produced the Caroline divines. The works of a succession of learned men placed the Church of England on the foundation of primitive antiquity. This was a powerful standpoint against Rome. It was also an effectual barrier against all attempts to merge the Church in the general mass of Protestantism. Primitive antiquity is unmistakeable in its witness to episcopacy. It was impossible to unite with bodies which had rejected episcopacy. The Restoration was as much the work of the Presbyterians as of the Royalists, or more so, and it was natural that an effort should again be made to bring the Presbyterian party into the Church. The king himself desired it. But the rooted objections of the Presbyterians to the ancient Catholic offices of the Church made conciliation impossible. Many of their objections were so captious that it was evident they would be content with nothing less than victory—nothing less than a wholesale mutilation of the Prayer-book, to which the clergy, wishing to preserve their Catholic heritage, could never consent. The last attempt of the same kind was made after the Revolution of 1688, and this, too, was foiled by the resistance of the High Church party in convocation. It seems plain that any fresh attempt to absorb Protestant Dissenters would meet with the same opposition from all who believe episcopacy to be apostolic, and therefore divine, and who regard the Liturgy as embodying the Catholic tradition of the Church. If the Liturgy were altered to please Puritans and Latitudinarians, the great High Church party would be forced to secede, and it is now more powerful and active than ever. Would the Church survive such a loss? It may be said that there has been a secession before—that of the Nonjurors, and that it died out.

The secession of the Nonjurors was indeed a lamentable event. The Church was deprived of most of its piety and learning. The secession included the great names of Hickes and Collier, the sainted names of Ken and Law, and such scholars as Hearne and Baker, as well as many conscientious and devoted clergymen unknown to fame. But in that generation, the weight of the establishment was strong enough to defy such losses

even as these. The people cared less and less for religion, but stood by the Protestant Church ; the secession of the Nonjurors was due to political causes which in two generations came to an end ; the piety of the secession may be said to have passed into the new fervour of Methodism, and that ended in a fresh secession which has at last merged the followers of the High Churchman Wesley in the general mass of dissent. No such history could be expected for High Churchmen now if they were driven out of the establishment. There would probably be a large accession to the Church of Rome, but it would be foolish to augur the eventual results. In the last century the Established Church had expelled the High Churchmen and sank into uselessness and indifference ; it was protected by the power of the State and the acquiescence of the people. In our day we may be quite certain that an Established Church which did no work would never be supported by the State, and one which had no creed, would find little support among Christian people. Moreover, if it lost its creed it would inevitably lose its motive and power for work. The doctrines which proved fatal to the admission of Dissenters in the 17th century, but were afterwards so long forgotten, have been revived with great power and success in our own day, and it certainly appears that the Prayer-book, as it stands, is on their side. How can those who think them superstitions be admitted without altering the Prayer-book ? How can the High Church party ever consistently allow this? Any scheme of comprehension then must be impracticable, unless it be thought a good thing to exclude those who believe in the Prayer-book, in order to let in those who do not. It is, however, undeniable, that the doctrines to which I refer have never taken hold of the great body of the people. The clergy and their families and a certain number of followers may believe in the divine origin of the Church, in the indispensable character of episcopal orders, and in the supernatural efficacy of the sacraments ; but I see no sign that the English people in general believe in or take the slightest interest in these things. This brings us to the startling paradox of an Established Church, intended for the nation, wishing to include the nation governed by the political authorities of the nation, but committed irrevocably to beliefs in which the nation does not share.

It is no use denying that there are three very different views of Christianity now prevalent among us; it might seem harsh to speak of three religions. The first is historical, the second emotional, and the third philosophical. The first considers certain things essential to salvation that are not considered so by the second and third ; the first and second insist on as vital truths what the third regards as doubtful and immaterial. The first is that probably of a majority of the clergy ; the second is that of most Dissenters and of most of the religious poor ; the third is that of an increasing and influential number of the educated class. At present the Church includes all three. But the Prayer-book is undeniably with the first ; the emotionalists care little for the Prayer-book and understand it less ; the philosophers take it in a non-natural sense. If the emotionalists and the philosophers combine to defeat the third party the Prayer-book must go, and the Church, if it remain as an Establishment, will not last long as a religious body ; for religion, as it appears to me, cannot be based with safety either on a philosophy or on feeling, though it must, of course, have both. Without a basis of historical fact, emotion will evaporate into sentiment, and mere philosophical theories will be shattered by materialism. Now, the Church of England, by its authorised formulas and its episcopal hierarchy, offers this firm ground of history to her worshippers. Any plan which shall deprive her of this standpoint seems to me far more dangerous than loss of privileges and endowments. For what is the real article of a standing or a falling Church ? Surely it is the truth of the historical incarnation and resurrection of Christ our Lord. Without a firm hold on this a Church may be popular, wealthy, intellectual, flourishing, for a time ; but it is dead. It has deserted the only cause for its existence. We know what has become of the Protestant Churches of Holland, Germany and Switzerland. Their ministers openly declare their disbelief in all miracles ; they assert that Christ's resurrection is but a metaphor and a phrase. And they are perishing ; the people care not for them. Have not some dissenting sects in our own country given way to the same infection ? I have no doubt that these bodies have fallen away from the faith principally because they have lost their historical connexion with the Primitive Church. There is, as I have said, a powerful party in our Church, including some even among the clergy, who desire to explain away the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The plain words in the Creeds are sorely in their way. Philosophical intellects may see their way to reading a "not" into the Apostles' Creed. Some few clergymen may feel quite comfortable in meaning one thing by the words they repeat, while their congregations suppose they mean quite another ; but plain English minds will find it impossible to admire this process. If the Prayer-book could only be altered, or parts of it made optional, it would be much easier for the Church to retain the services of these gentlemen who are so willing to surrender, if I may parody a well-known bull, three-quarters, nay, the whole of Christianity, if they may but preserve the remainder.

I know that it is the aim of many liberal thinkers to preserve the shell, the machinery of the Church, in the hope that, when all supernatural religion has been eliminated, it may become, as they suppose, a really useful organ of the State. It is such a proposal as this that makes one shudder, not at the thought of disestablishment, but rather at the thought of continued establishment on the present footing. Who can tell what may be forced upon the Church whenever we should have a Premier who might be a Liberal in theology as well as in politics, and Bishops selected for their latitudinarian opinions ? No doubt an alliance between the two other parties, the High and Low Church, would be strong enough to resist any such attacks, but in spite of the better feeling which certainly prevails between religious men of opposite opinions, we cannot fail to see that such an alliance is more than ever impossible. The sacramental doctrines which the one party most values, and which the other rejects, are either a most necessary body of truths, or a farrago of impostures. As long as men are peaceable and illogical, this divergence may be glossed over, but events are sure sooner or later to insist on its reality.

It is, indeed, an attractive dream which we are sometimes invited to enjoy, the union of all Evangelical Christians against vice and unbelief. A dissenting minister at Hertford looks with rapture to the time when he will be exchanging pulpits with the rector of All Saints. Truly it would be a blessed thing if it were possible to see all Christians devoted only to one holy

cause, and all Christian ministers united in preaching the same simple Gospel. But is it practicable? If Christ founded a Church in which alone men may be saved, is it right for those who believe this to admit into their pulpits those who do not? I cannot see how the High Church party could consistently do so; and if the pulpits of the Church are to be regarded as the property of the nation, the Roman Catholic and the Unitarian, nay, the Jew, the Positivist, and the Infidel, have an equal right there with the Protestant Dissenter. I am aware that in some parts of the continent the same churches are used in turn by Catholic and Protestant; but I imagine this is in districts where each class of religionists is marked off sharply from the other by tradition, and there is no likelihood of controversy. In this country, how could we answer for our flocks if they were liable to hear every sort of heresy from the same pulpit as the Gospel is delivered from?

Things are gone too far, some might think, in this direction already. I have myself heard, in Westminster Abbey, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity expounded in what the preacher called "the only reasonable sense." I was unable to understand precisely what the preacher meant, but all mystery disappeared under his analysis, except the mystery of his own confusion. To some this phenomenon of clergymen not believing the doctrines of their Church may suggest, as I said above, still further comprehension. To others, of whom I am one, it suggests the terrible responsibility of a Church which allows such unfaithfulness to be unrebuked and unchecked. Does the Church owe nothing to the poor and ignorant members of Christ's flock? Are they to be liable to hear in the name of the Church, from her authorised teachers, doctrines which involve the denial of Christ's divinity? It is a simple fact that there are clergymen of influence who deny the literal truth of the Resurrection. If the Church governed herself, surely these men would be invited to withdraw from their situations. Helpless as the Church is now, under the heel of the State, she can do nothing.

No doubt it is true that even in an independent church, false teaching may creep in. Some of the instances to which I have above referred of foreign churches prove this. But the peculiar and terrible danger of the Church of England is that she may be made heretical against her will, and is bound hand and foot, while her ordained ministers are propagating infidelity in her name. Mr. Voysey, to be sure, was obliged to desist from his intention of raising the Church to his own level, but it was a most costly affair, and since his time the danger has very largely increased.

The system of the Church of England, as regards doctrine, is a legalised anarchy, and while she remains on her present footing, this anarchy is likely to be increased. It has been gravely proposed to place the government of every parish, in reference to ecclesiastical matters, in the hands of a board of ratepayers. How could such a system ever be consistent with a fearless preaching of Christ's truth? There are many who would like to have the national religion conducted on the same principles as the *Times* newspaper. But can such be the function of the Church of Christ? Such considerations as the foregoing have brought very strongly before my mind the drawbacks and dangers of Establishment. I am far from insensible to its advantages. The only possible interest these remarks can possess, deficient as I know they are both in originality and learning, may arise from the fact that they represent the recently-matured and slowly-formed convictions which have been forced by reflection and observation on one who has always hitherto been a devoted admirer of our existing constitution in Church and State. And even now one cannot be blind to the great social advantages which are still such a valuable lever for forwarding the Church's work, and which spring from its political position. Such providential opportunities and aids are not to be lightly cast away. But if they are to be taken from us, there certainly seem to be not a few gains which might compensate for the loss. And valuable and beautiful as our parochial system has been, we know that in towns it has almost broken down, and in the country it works with very various success. I have been recently taking duty in a district where there are three good livings contiguous, well endowed, filled by pious, learned, and able men. In all these places the churches are all but empty. The people are not hostile to the Church, but quite indifferent to it. They are all Dissenters, and there seems no chance of their conversion. Such a state of things is most disheartening to the incumbents, who are forced to reside there, without the consciousness or the hope of being appreciated by their people.

It is at least doubtful whether disestablishment would imply loss of evangelising power. Another possible loss might be that of the peculiar and refined type of piety which has been the glory of our Church from the time of George Herbert to the time of Keble. But the influences of the past, and the influences of the Prayer-book may be expected to cling to the Church in her humiliation, at least, as much as in her pride, and by the blessing of God, still to mould the character of her children.

What it appears to me we should certainly gain by a separation from the State would be the following: The restoration of a godly discipline; this we declare every Ash Wednesday is a thing devoutly to be wished. No one can fail to see the injustices and abuses that have sprung from the existence of a strict discipline in many times and places. But who can read the New Testament and think the Church to be in a healthy state, from which the open sinner is never cut off till he repents his sin?

The Church would have her own tribunals, and be responsible for the teaching of her ministers; if false doctrine came in then, at least it would be the Church's own fault, but probably the offices of a disendowed society would not be attractive to the successors of Middleton and Hoadley.

The great incomes would be lost, but probably the average provision for the clergy would be better, and the right man would more often be in the right place.

And I fancy, while we should lose the homage of numbers, we should gain an increased sense of Christian fellowship among the faithful who remained. How little there is of religious sympathy among nominal English Church-people! How often it seems as if religion was to be a useful topic for the rich to dilate upon to the poor, but never mentioned on any account to ears polite! We should have a union of hearts instead of a uniformity of observances.

On the other hand, we should have to fear the tyranny of congregations, a very dangerous prospect. Perhaps the size of the Anglican Church, and the large number it includes of refined and educated people might reduce this evil. We might have to fear a lower standard of education among the clergy. At

present we lose something by drawing them too exclusively from the educated class.

Whatever may be in store for us, it appears to me that the one thing we have to think of is the integrity of our belief. If we preserve that, God will preserve a faithful branch of His Church, whether or not our temporal position may be altered. If we lose that, the candlestick of the Church of England will be removed. Instead of the incense of an acceptable worship, there will be the stench of an extinguished light. If we have to choose, in our own day, between our faith and our earthly welfare, may God give us grace to be firm and true. I have found myself obliged to touch on many points in the most cursory way, and to make many statements that must seem to require proof. But I have tried to look at the subject from all points of view, and if I have abstained from forming any positive conclusion, I have tried to indicate what seems to me a very subtle danger, to which our established position renders us liable—that in days of prevalent unbelief, we may lose greater things than glebes and tithes. If I have shewn a proclivity towards the High Church section of our Church, it is chiefly because I believe them to possess the strongest bulwarks for the blessed truth in which High and Low equally believe ; when I have sometimes stated the High Church point of view, I would not be understood in all cases to share it confidently myself, feeling above all desirous of one thing, that peace and moderation, without sacrifice of convictions, may abound among all who believe that the Son of God has come into the world.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—In reply to the Rev. R. Galbraith, I will endeavour to indicate, as concisely as I can, the modes in which, as it appears to me, perplexities such as he has felt may be removed. His question may receive either a general or a particular answer. If we give the former, we may ask an inquirer what kind of information he supposes the Bible designed to impart. Is it the province of a revelation to disclose that which man by the use of his own faculties can discover for himself in process of time, or to impart those spiritual truths which by their very nature lie outside the sphere of these faculties? Is it, in short, to anticipate the results of scientific research or to give a glimpse of what lies behind the veil? If the latter, as I believe will be generally admitted, it seems inevitable that spiritual truths must be conveyed in words and by ideas familiar to those to whom they are addressed. If not, either a revelation must be prefaced by a preliminary discourse on science, or be couched in terms which must remain for many centuries unintelligible. Perhaps we may find that there are hid treasures of this kind in the Bible, but we cannot suppose that the latter is likely to be the usual course. Hence we need not be surprised if the Bible, in relation to such sciences as astronomy, zoology, and geology, uses terms and contains statements which were current at the date when any one of its books was written, but which have been proved to be incomplete or incorrect by the accumulated discoveries and knowledge of many subsequent generations.

But in case this general answer appear to the inquirer too bold and sweeping, I will give one relating only to the particular question which Mr. Galbraith has asked. His obliging reply to my question with reference to the Ten Commandments enables me to make my answer more brief by confining it to the use of the word "day" in the first chapter of Genesis. If this word certainly refers to a period of twenty-four hours, the Mosaic record appears difficult to reconcile with the modern hypothesis of evolution. But is that the meaning of the word "day"? In reply to this, as I do not feel myself competent to decide a question concerning a language of which I know very little, I will quote the words of my valued friend the Rev. P. H. Mason, whom all Cambridge students will recognise as one of the most profound Hebrew scholars (to say the least) in that University. He thus writes (Preface to "Hebrew" Exercise-book, p. vii.) : "Is it too much, then, to say that all objections and difficulties and doubts which rest upon the supposition that the Book of Genesis speaks of either 'Six days of Creation' or 'Creation' of 'species' fall at once to the ground? The Book does not so speak, as all may see who will." To this clear and decisive testimony I will add a few words of my own, relating to the connexion of the opening chapter of Genesis and of Evolution (Sermons on "Some Questions of the Day," p. 7) : "If the evolution hypothesis be true, and if its results had to be communicated to thoroughly unscientific minds (for the age of the Mosaic record was the world's infancy in science, and its childhood has lasted so long that we are now only witnessing the commencement of its puberty), then I do not see how some idea of these results could be better imparted than by such picturesque verbal diagrams as these ; by seizing the successive salient points in a continuous history of myriads of years, projecting them on the mind like a series of dissolving views, which gather into distinctness, and fade away into nothingness, like the dawning and the parting of the day."

T. G. BONNEY.

We regret to be obliged to hold over letters from "Cui Bono," "M.D.," "Broadchurch," the Rev. Peter Royston, and others, as well as several papers and reviews.

On Friday, the 11th inst., the Bishop of Durham, addressing a meeting at Newcastle, said that matters with regard to the new See were now far advanced, and he should be grievously disappointed if the next spring passed away without the town having a Bishop of its own. The right rev. prelate has written to Canon Whitley as follows :—"I beg to acknowledge the receipt of a numerously signed memorial which you forwarded to me a few days ago advocating the transference of all public ecclesiastical patronage in the county of Northumberland to the See of Newcastle-on-Tyne. I have already declared publicly my intention of taking steps to transfer my own patronage in that county to the new See, as soon as it is created ; and I have now the pleasure of announcing that the Bishops of Chester and Manchester have expressed their willingness to do the same with theirs. I am sure that the generous action of these Bishops, on whom the new See has not the same claim as on myself, will be gratefully appreciated in Northumberland."

SUPPLEMENT
TO
The Church of England Pulpit,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XII.—No. 309. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1881.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—One of old said of Himself to an incredulous disciple, Ἐγὼ εἰμί ἡ ἀλήθεια; and, had the inquiry, Τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια, been made in sincerity, the several inquirers after ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια would not have been left long in doubt as to the meaning of the speaker. The spirit of intolerance is not extinct in our own day, and conjoined to it is too often found a spirit of impatience and supercilious disregard of others' scruples of conscience, of others' doubts as to the superior wisdom of their preceptors.

In the controversy which has been going on in your journal, *re* the "Contagious Diseases Acts," many, doubtless, like myself, seekers after truth, have been looking and longing for the disproof of such allegations as "An Irishwoman," Miss A. E. N. Bewicke, "Veritas," and other correspondents, have brought against the working of the Acts; but so far they have looked in vain, and the challenge of "An Irishwoman" has not yet been met (*vide* PULPIT, October 22nd), "Some of your correspondents are accused of being 'illogical,' but the accusers are unable to refute the three fatal objections to their system, that it is unjust, immoral, and inefficient."

Your correspondent, "A Surgeon," hopes one of the opponents of the Acts "will be more careful in future to avoid untrue statements." Knowing something of the *modus operandi* of these Acts, I may say that the separation of the classes, if it may be so put, within the Lock Hospital in question, is entirely a matter of internal administration, more perfectly carried out in some than in other similar establishments.

But in the best of them the evil of continued companionship is very sad and degrading in its effects on the minds of these inmates. "An Inhabitant of Chatham" evidently supposes that the writer whom she attacks implies that no such separation exists; but it seems to me that "Veritas" was not attacking so much the details of its administration as the Act of Parliament itself, as containing provisions based on principles which are in direct contradiction of morality and of the injunctions of the Divine Law. Yet, after all, the statements contained in her own letter do not involve an absolute contradiction of those of the writer to whom she is opposed. They amount simply to a modification of his statements upon an important matter of detail.

And in order to reconcile those statements with the view taken by their challenger, it is only necessary to read into the sentences, quoted by her, the words in italics:—"So these Acts. . . *tend to* convert," etc. "The State can make no *adequate and invariably equitable* distinction," etc. It is evident from the context that this was what was in the mind of the writer. But on such "slight grounds"—and "An Inhabitant," etc., has apparently no other—to imply that the opponents of the Acts are publishers of *falsehood*, is surely to go beyond the limits of legitimate controversy. For the rest, although "Veritas" may have made a slight "slip" (of the pen), a comparison of Miss Bewicke's letter with those of "A Surgeon" and your Chatham correspondent, will suffice to show that the "slips" are not all on the side of the writer whose title to his *nom de plume* is challenged and disputed.

* * * * * *

I have to thank you for your notice of my argument in last week's PULPIT. May I submit to your readers a difficulty which such restrictions seem to me to involve, if on reference to the context they can be maintained? Should we not then have to construe other portions of the Gospel accordingly, and adapt its sublime and holy sanctions to the views of the unregenerate human heart? Would it not be lowering Scripture to man's standard of right and wrong, instead of raising that standard to the Divine, as revealed in the New Testament? Another difficulty occurs to me; compare (*a*) Matt. xix. 10—12; Mark x. 10, with (*b*) Mark iv. 10—13; Matt. xiii. 11; Luke viii. 10; Matt. xi. 35. Thus the principal passages whence I derived my inferences as to our Lord's teaching on the subject of adultery, were repeated in private to the Disciples as distinguished from the Pharisees. (See Matt. xix. 27—32; Mark x. 3—12.) "And in the house the disciples asked him again of this matter." The obligations of a husband and wife—as I pointed out in paragraphs two and four in my last—are reciprocal. Mark x. 11, 12. I had in view the customs of the Jews, but it was those very customs of which our Lord disapproved, and which He condemned. He did not allow His disciples to doubt His meaning. In fact the difficulty in my mind does not seem altogether solved in your editorial note. The definition of adultery, to which I demur, involves us in a dilemma of another kind, which I can best illustrate by referring to the case of Jacob and Leah. Laban's plea (Gen. xxix. 26) was surely no adequate excuse for his gross deception of Jacob, and his wrong to Rachel, unless human customs are to supersede moral sanctions and Divine laws. (Gen. ii. 21—24; the institution of marriage.) Observe what conse-

quences Laban's fraud involved. Did Jacob, when he knew Leah (chapter xxix. 23, 25) annul his contract with Laban, and forego his rights to Rachel? Was the "custom of the country" more valid than his contract, and his right to his reward? Did he "commit adultery" (Matt. v. 27, 28) by desiring the younger before the elder? Or in seeking her after consummating his marriage with Leah? And in that consummation who was the transgressor? Was Leah? She was obeying her father Laban's *fiat.* Did his authority constitute the daughter's duty, in defiance of Jacob's and Rachel's claims? Did it justify her in dishonouring her sister? Other difficulties present themselves, but I must not continue the argument at the expense of your other correspondents.

Nov. 14th. E. G.

SIR,—On reading my previous letter which you were good enough to insert in your valuable paper, I was hardly satisfied with its tone. There seemed to be a deficiency of the humility which ought to be manifested in speaking of others or quoting their words. Let me apologise to any of your readers who may have felt as I did on reading that letter. "An Irishwoman" thinks evidently that polygamy is as bad as prostitution, if not worse; looks upon it as adultery in fact; but I believe in none of those conclusions. Your own remarks on the subject, sir, seem to me to be impregnably fortified by the consideration that if polygamy be adultery, then the "sweet singer of Israel"—who had of all men perhaps the greatest love for God's law, and the fullest appreciation of its comprehensiveness, the man whose psalms we chant in the worship of Almighty God—lived and died an impenitent violator of the seventh commandment.

As to the state of public opinion, if truly represented by your correspondent referred to above, that opinion seems to me a very perverse one on the point in question, seeing that, whilst it will not tolerate polygamy, it does tolerate prostitution. Public opinion needs to be educated perhaps in regard to both these subjects. But I am glad to stand on common ground with "An Irishwoman"—one of her compatriots taught me when a child the truths which make men wise unto salvation—in regard to the punishment proper for seducers; and, let me add for the seduced also. It would satisfy my wish on the subject if the responsibility of the act of seduction were to be made legally binding upon both, the one in having to contribute to the maintenance of the other, and the other to be kept under surveillance and restrained from marriage and prostitution.

I am invited to publish a refutation of Mr. Mill's work on "The Subjection of Women." But, sir, the ground is cut away from under my feet. The work in question has been refuted by anticipation, and by hands less liable to error than mine. Not to occupy the time of your respected correspondent with a perusal of the work in full, let me refer her back to a conpendium of it, with which, I presume, she is familiar. It is to be found in the address to married persons and others in the "Order of Matrimony," the writers Peter and Paul, saints by calling. I should be sorry to think that "An Irishwoman" attaches more weight to the reasonings of the learned sceptic than to the inspired words of the two apostles. Whatever be the extent of the equality there is between Christ and the Church, there is such a measure of inequality as requires her subjection to Him. So is it also between husband and wife. And one must be - not only "misty" in vision, but stone-blind, who fails to see that the Apostles of Christ teach in language unmistakeable, whatever Mr. Mill has said, that the husband is in the position of relative authority, and the woman in the position of subjection to him. Women were taught of old to learn this truth of the divine economy. Now Mr. Mill and his admirers would have them unlearn it; and, to all appearance, he has no lack of apt scholars. May I protest, once more, against the charge with which "An Irishwoman's" letter opens, namely, that I have tried to prove "that polygamy is no worse" than monogamy."

Misrepresentations of that sort, however unintentional or oft-repeated, cannot promote the cause of truth.

There is, I think, both a parallel and a contrast between the case in 1 Cor. vi. 16 and that of lawful marriage. In both cases alike the male and female become "one flesh;" but the former connection is unlawful, because of fornication and adultery, a cause which does not exist in the case of seduction of virgins, so as to prevent true matrimony so far as God's law on the subject is concerned. May I repeat my illustrative case:—David and Bathsheba became one flesh, though the connection was adulterous. But in the murder of the woman's noble husband the impediment to lawful marriage was gone, and it would have but added another to the sins of the king had he failed to guard as wife or pensioner one to whom he had bound himself by an irremediable act. CLK.

SIR,—Having read the many letters which have appeared in THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT on the subject of polygamy, I think the following passage which I came across a day or two ago when reading F. W. Robertson's notes on Genesis, bears directly on this subject. "Now let it be remembered that in those days (*i.e.*, in the life-time of Jacob) there was no law against polygamy, and therefore in that act there was no sin; for, says the Apostle, 'sin is not imputed where there is no law.' And yet you will observe that, though this was no sin in Jacob, yet that the penalty followed, for it was against the constitution of God's world; still, as it was not in contradiction to any revealed law, his conscience was not defiled; it was but penalty, not chastisement." I am induced to send you the above quotation, believing that your readers will value the words of a theologian so *manly* and *liberal* as the late Robertson of Brighton.

November 21st, 1881. J. W. A.

SIR,—"Veritas" seems to be unaware that the Contagious Diseases Acts, 29 and 30 Vic., Cap. 35, Sec. 12 enact "that adequate provision be made for moral and religious instruction, before a Lock hospital can be certified." Your readers therefore will see these Acts do *more* than merely "*not* exclude voluntary operations," they *enforce* moral and religious instruction as part of their plan, and the officials are bound to obey. It is not a matter of private philanthropy—however greatly that feeling may enter into their work—in doing what good they can, but a simple obedience to orders. The *outline* given, the bye-laws fill in, according to the *intention* of that *outline,* and the regulation quoted by "A Surgeon" in one of his earlier letters—I do not remember which—viz., "It will be the duty of the officers of the hospital when patients desire to reform, to assist them as far as possible in entering refuges, joining their relatives or

friends, or in procuring employment after discharge from hospital," is one availed of fully at the hospitals, and carried out. The same principle is also followed by the police, likewise by order, and though some may be more earnest than others, and be more successful in rescuing those who are *nearly* lost, I can say, as I have made it my business to make myself acquainted with facts, that these maligned men have saved, since the Acts have been in force in these towns, *numbers* of young girls from a life of sin. They find them in dens of infamy, they warn and persuade them to return home, and when they find them afraid to face parental wrath, they *take them home*, and get them reconciled to their parents. I do not see the slightest reason to fear that a system so opposed to English ideas, and so diametrically opposite as "the French system of a Police of Morals" is to the English "Contagious Diseases Acts," will ever be introduced into this country, and the constant flashing of such ideas into the minds of audiences composed of timid women who know nothing of the other side, is disingenuous to say the least of it. The policemen working the Contagious Diseases Acts are picked men, and to qualify them for the post must be married men. In this district—I know and converse with them often—they are Churchmen and communicants. I have watched with the deepest concern the effect of the carrying out of these Acts here, and therefore do not feel the necessity of studying the evidence of "Mr. Snagge and others." I am as anxious as your correspondent "Veritas" "that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth should be told," and *that* anxiety, having it in my power from knowledge of the subject, led me to write my first letter, for inserting which, and also my second, I beg to thank you.

AN INHABITANT OF CHATHAM.

SIR,—As "Another Clergyman and Paterfamilias" asks a question in reference to my remarks, I will, with your permission, observe that if "it does not *follow* that the thing which he (Onan) did was *not* in itself sinful" (the italics are mine), neither does it follow that it *was*. There is no analogy in the case of murder (as stated by your correspondent), for murder is declared to be *always* sinful. Not so the act alluded to. If such, between man and wife, with mutual consent, be sinful, I have never heard any sensible reason why it should be so. You, sir, allude to a "penalty" by injury to health, arising from such, in the opinion of medical men. I should like to hear good medical opinion on this point, as I have never before heard of any such consequence; nor can I imagine how it could result. Perhaps your correspondent, "A Surgeon," who writes like a sensible man, will give the benefit of his opinion. It will, I think, seem more like sin to disregard the discretion which God gives us than to use it, while yet providing against "Satan's tempting us for our incontinence."

Again, referring to polygamy, your correspondent says, "I cannot see how each woman can have *her own* husband." In monogamy it is clearly *impossible*, since, even were all men to marry, there would not be nearly sufficient to give a husband to "each woman."

AMICUS.

The Hon. and Rev. E. V. Bligh has accepted the chairmanship of the Prayer-book Revision Society, in succession to Lord Ebury, who retires in consequence of his increasing years.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

The Dean, in introducing this subject to the Lichfield Diocesan Conference, said that there were indications that a new and powerful effort would be made in the next session of Parliament to alter the law of marriage in this respect. It was, therefore, necessary to review the principle on which the prohibitory table was constructed. There were solid reasons for deprecating any change in the law. There were (1) the Scriptural, (2) the ecclesiastical, (3) the social arguments. He then entered exhaustively into the Scriptural argument. The general principle of the Divine law on this point was laid down in Lev. xviii. 6. From the examples given in the chapter it would be seen that consanguinity and affinity were placed on an equal footing as far as the husband and wife are concerned. If the brother of the husband is forbidden to the widow, the sister of the wife is *pari ratione* forbidden to the widower. The relaxation of the law in the former case was an exemption granted with a special view to the Jewish law of inheritance. The legal maxim here holds good, "*Exceptio probat regulum in exemplis non exceptis.*" With regard to Lev. xviii. 18, it would be contrary to every sound principle of interpretation to interpret this verse in a sense contrary to the main principle laid down in verse 6, and its application in verse 16. The more obscure text must be interpreted by the clearer. Proceeding to the ecclesiastical argument, the Dean showed that for the first 1,500 years of Christianity the universal Church prohibited these marriages. Dispensations from Rome were not heard of until Alexander VI. (Borgia) granted one to the King of Portugal. The *Reformatio Legum* gave evidence that the mind of the Church at the Reformation period was the same. He had no time to enter into the social question. Intimations from Germany and America as to the effect of relaxing these restrictions might well make marriage law reformers pause. The restrictions were founded on the law of God, had been maintained by the Church, and had contributed much to the purity and happiness of our family and domestic life. He then moved the following resolution :—

"That this Conference earnestly deprecates any alteration in the marriage law of this Church and realm which would permit the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister, and thus disturb the great principle upon which the Table of Prohibited Degrees has been constructed."

Mr. T. Salt (Stafford) referred to the Parliamentary history of the question, and pointed out that Lord Lyndhurst's Act of 1835 did not make illegal what were legal before. That measure made these marriages not merely voidable, but absolutely null and void. He then reviewed the arguments adduced by the supporters of the movement. It was not a clergyman's question merely. It concerned all who valued the pure pleasures of English family life. He seconded the motion.—The Rev. R. W. Essington said it was clear that there was a great deal to be said on both sides. He thought the grievance was felt among the working classes.—Archbishop Iles denied that these marriages were common among the working classes. In his experience at Wolverhampton, the trouble arose from the middle and lower middle classes.—Prebendary Grier contended that the agitation was got up to a great degree by interested persons. If the retro-

spective clause were struck out, the agitation would almost collapse. The Parliament of England, however, could not change the moral law of Christendom.

Canon Lonsdale asked how it was that the feeling in favour of these marriages was a growing one, if the arguments against them were unanswerable. He had great doubts on the subject. Perhaps he inherited some heresy on it from his father, who was not unknown in Lichfield. The only difficulty to him was the ecclesiastical view of the matter. The law of the Church had certainly always been against these marriages.

The discussion having been continued by Mr. H. H. Bemrose (Derby), Mr. M. How, the Rev. R. H. Goodacre, and Col. Drake,

The Bishop doubted whether the movement had made such rapid progress as was supposed. If it had, it was due to agitation, which usually influenced those who had no very decided opinions of their own. The agitation had been kept up by interested parties. There was, besides, in the present day a general tendency to break down restrictions and restraints even in a matter so sacred as that of marriage. Not many years ago a step had been taken, the ill effects of which could scarcely be stated—viz., the establishment of the Divorce Court. It was to be feared that many now entered lightly into the marriage state with an almost unconscious *arrière pensée* that it could, if desired, be very easily got rid of. He regarded the present movement as only another step in the direction of breaking down those restrictions in respect of marriage which he believed had been one of the greatest safeguards for the happiness of English family life.

The resolution was carried almost unanimously by both orders.

The Bishop, in closing the Conference, congratulated the members on the excellent spirit which had pervaded all their discussions, whilst their resolutions had, without exception, been carried with overwhelming majorities of both clergy and laity. They could not but regard them as deliberate expressions of the opinion of the Conference, and it was very satisfactory that there should have been such unanimity in the conclusions arrived at.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anderson, Rev. David, vicar of Holy Trinity, Twickenham-common; rural dean of Hampton.
Arthur, Rev. William Wills, rector of Atherington.
Atkinson, Rev. Frederic, vicar of Long Eaton; rector of Darley.
Bindley, Rev. F. W., rector of Gosforth, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Caley, Rev. George Augustus, vicar of Haselbury Plucknett.
Cole, Rev. William Alston, rector of East Lockinge, Berks.
Cooper, Rev. Wingfield, curate of St. John the Evangelist, Copthorne.
Cotter, Rev. J. L., perpetual curate of St. Paul's-in-the-Square, Liverpool; rector of Burmarsh.
Curtis, Rev. Hubert, curate of St. Mark's, Surbiton; incumbent of the Church of the Ascension, Balham-hill.
Fisher, Rev. Frederick Leycester, rector of Barkway with Reed.
Fisher, Rev. George Carnac, vicar of St. Mary with St. Nicholas, Beverley.
Harrison, Rev. W., curate of St. Peter's, Walsall; curate of Wickhambrook, Suffolk.
Harwood, Rev. Reynold, chaplain of Lucas's Hospital, Wokingham.
Hawes, Rev. Langdon, vicar of Bottisham Lode; vicar of St. Paul, Sheerness.
Hicks, Rev. Herbert, vicar of St. Peter's, North Shields; vicar of Holy Saviour's, Tynemouth.
Hodgkins, Rev. Joseph Rogerson Edmond Cotter, perpetual curate of St. Cyprian's, Edge-hill, Liverpool.
Holland, Rev. Philip Esme Stewart, vicar of Hoddesdon.
Homfray, Rev. Francis Alexander, chaplain of Tyntesfield Chapel, Wraxall.
Hutchings, Rev. J., curate of Quebec Chapel; vicar of St. Barnabas, Marylebone.
Jenkins, Rev. J. Howe, curate of St. Martin's. Salisbury; incumbent of St. John-the-Baptist, Dundee, and chaplain of St. Mary's Home, Dundee.
Jones, Rev. H. D., rector of Upper St. Leonard's.
Kane, Rev. John Blackburne, vicar of Bicester, Oxon.
Lambert, Rev. Joseph Malet, perpetual curate of Newland.
Lawrence, Rev. Frederick, vicar of Westow.
Leeson, Rev. W. N., vicar of Wytham; vicar of Patcham.
Lukin, Rev. James, rector of Wickford.
Lush, Rev. William, vicar of Stixwold; rector of Snargate and Snave.
Moberly, Rev. Walter Allan, perpetual curate of St. Philip, Sydenham.
Overton, Rev. C. F., vicar of Warnham.
Robinson, Rev. Arthur William, rector of East Shefford, Berks.
Robinson, Rev. George, curate in sole charge of Allerton, Bradford; curate of Holy Trinity, Haverstock-hill, London.
Rosenthal, Rev. Samuel, vicar of Sandon.
Saunders, Rev. John Goulding, vicar of Christ Church, Portsdown; vicar of Horton-cum-Woodlands.
Savory, Rev. Edmund, rector of Binfield, Berks, and rural dean; proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Oxford.
Seddon, Rev. William Herbert, curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford; perpetual curate of Little Aston.
Simpkinson, Rev. Charles Hare, perpetual curate of Holy Trinity, Greenwich.
Thompson, Rev. John, vicar of St. Mary, Hunslet, Leeds.
Todd, Rev. George Augustus John, rector of Upper Swell.
Toyne, Rev. Frederick Elijah, vicar of St. Michael, Bournemouth.
Warlow, Ven. George, archdeacon of Madras.
Walsham, Rev. Charles, prebendary of Weighton in York Cathedral.
Williams, Rev. George, vicar of St. Thomas, Glyndypdwy.
Williams, Rev. Theodore, vicar of Scampston.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barrow, Rev. George Forster, M.A., curate of St. Stephen's, Westminster, at 38, Bessborough-street, on the 17th inst., aged 37.
Bost, Rev. John, founder of the Asiles de la Force, Dordogne, at Paris, on the 1st inst.
Clive, Rev. George Arthur, rector of Shrawardine and vicar of Montford, sixth son of the late W. Clive, Esq., of Styche, M.P. for Bishops Castle, and nephew of Robert, first Lord Clive, of Plassey, at Montford, Shropshire, on the 8th inst., aged 78.
Finch, Rev. Thomas, for thirty-eight years chaplain to the Northumberland County Prison, at Morpeth, on the 3rd inst., aged 81.
Hill, Rev. Thomas Leonard, M.A., at 17, Portland-place, Bath, on the 16th inst., aged 74.
Hutton, Rev. William, for thirty-seven years vicar of Beetham, Westmoreland, at Beetham House, on the 20th inst., aged 76.
Jones, Rev. James, M.A., of Jesus College, Oxford, formerly second master of Ruthin School, and for the last thirty years rector of Llanfwrog, Denbighshire, at Fir Grove, near Ruthin, on the 11th inst., in his 79th year.
Lightfoot, Rev. Nicholas Francis, for twenty-six years rector of Islip, Thrapston, at Islip Rectory, on the 19th inst., aged 70.
Patteson, Rev. William Frederick, vicar of St. Helen's, rural dean, and hon. canon of Norwich Cathedral, at St. Helen's-square, Norwich, on the 14th inst., aged 81.
Townley, Rev. Edmund, at Townhead, Ulverstone, on the 7th inst., aged 77.
Vaughan, Rev. John James, rector of Gotham and Ratcliffe-on-Soar, Notts, at Denne Park, Horsham, on the 17th inst., aged 72.
Watherston, Rev. John Dundas, M.A., rector of Llanrothal, Herefordshire, and lecturer of Jones' Charity, Monmouth, at the Lecturer's House, Monmouth, on the 8th inst., aged 62.

The Church of England Pulpit.

HARVEST SERMON, 1881.

By the Rev. EDWARD MEADE, M.A., Canon of Salisbury, and Rector of Winkfield, Wilts.

Preached at Winkfield, September 25th, 1881.

"Then Job arose, and rent his mantle, and shaved his head, and fell down upon the ground, and worshipped, and said: Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord."—Job i. 20, 21.

O THAT there were in all, who are called by the name of Christ, the spirit of these divine words! Then would the secret of the Lord be with us, indeed; then should we live independent of outward circumstances; the fountain of peace should be within us—a fountain, not only rich in present refreshment, but springing up unto eternal life.

It is an easy thing to smile when we are pleased; and, when our enterprises are successful, and our garners are filled with all manner of store, to rejoice and be glad. It is a far different thing to maintain a thankful spirit in the day of adversity, to "rest in the day of trouble," and to say with the Prophet—"Although the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat, the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stall, *yet* I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation." It is no easy thing to contemplate, with an even mind, the *reverses* of human life—to see the hand of God alike, and equally to approve His sovereign will, in the fluctuating circumstances of our mysterious course; and hence we are too apt to regard, with an admiration not unmixed with a degree of incredulity, rather than with an ambition to imitate it, the noble profession of the blessed Paul—"I have learned, in whatever state I am, therewith to be content; I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: everywhere, and in all things, I have learned the secret, both to be full, and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need." And yet, the Patriarch Job, though he lived under a darker dispensation, and could not use the language of the Apostle, "I can do all things *through Christ*, who strengtheneth me," yet was able to meet the most afflicting changes with a holy composure, to own the hand, and to bless the name of God, in the cloudy as in the sunny day; he was able, through grace, not only to overcome the temptation to murmur and to charge God foolishly, but to accommodate himself to each dispensation as it came: "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord."

In these words we have a clear statement of the Providence of God in the affairs of human life; and, secondly, an example of the true disposition and experience of a child of God.

1. The calamities of Job had fallen upon him *fourfold*. Wave after wave had rolled in upon him in quick succession, till all which had before enriched and cheered him, and made his life joyous and hopeful, was swept away, and he had become like a vineyard trodden under foot, or like some despised and broken vessel. Of each of the four great troubles which had befallen him, a natural cause had been reported. It was by the *Sabæans* that the oxen had been taken, and driven away from their plowing, and the asses, as they were feeding by them. It was *fire from heaven* by which the sheep, and the keepers of the sheep, had been burnt and consumed. It was by three plundering bands of the *Chaldæans* that the camels had been carried away, and the servants slain; and it was by *a stormy wind* from the wilderness that the house, where the sons and daughters were feasting, had been cast down, and had buried all, except one only, the messenger of the sad tidings, in the ruins. Now, if Job could have anticipated the light of modern wisdom—to which the wisdom of God is foolishness—he would, no doubt, have fixed his mind, and allowed it to rest, upon the *instruments* of his great affliction. The Sabæans and the Chaldeans, the fire from heaven, and the stormy wind, would have been the foremost objects in his view. And so it must ever be with those who do "not like to retain God in their knowledge;" in second causes they seek and find the potency of human events; on the instruments, or agencies, they concentrate their thoughts, but they "regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of His hands." The conduct of Job is an instructive contrast to this, and an edifying example of the good and right way. He had learned, by the teaching of the Spirit of Truth, what the great King of Babylon was taught by a bitter experience, that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men." He acknowledged, as a great foundation principle, that "*He* forms the light, and creates darkness, that He makes peace, and creates evil. I the Lord do all these things." And hence he does not even notice the Sabæans, and the Chaldæans, the fire from heaven, and the tempest of wind; but, looking at once beyond the machinery to the moving hand, he exclaims: "*The Lord* gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord."

Now, it is no less strange than it is deplorable, that, in proportion as great discoveries in sciences and arts have wrought effects, as by steam and

electricity, which would, if suggested to our fathers of two or three generations ago, have been rejected at once as fabulous, or even impossible, there has been an evil and unreasonable heart of unbelief growing and spreading, and emboldening men to limit or deny the power of God to exercise a controlling influence in His own creation and in the affairs of men. While we know that our men of commerce can regulate their dealings on the other side of the globe, by sending, over land and under water, their instructions to agents abroad, in little or no time, and that our statesmen can control the negotiations of peace and war, with the like ease and rapidity, we scruple to admit, or practically deny, that God Himself, as an absolute Sovereign, is continually employing and directing those very forces which He has created, and by which even short-lived mortals are enabled to work marvels.

And now, apply this to the case of our harvest. It is no concern of the ministers of Christ to hold the balances of opinion, as to the character of this year's ingathering, though their eyes and ears are open, as well as those of other men; but, whichever side you take in your view of the facts, to direct your attention to the truth of God, as applicable to each alternative. We suppose you to admit that, taking the season *as a whole*, and comparing one production with another, there is, at least, an average return for outlay and labour; *then* the merciful dealing of God is certainly to be acknowledged with fervent thankfulness, and with liberal gifts for the benefit of those who need. But our rejoicing must be, if we are wise, "with trembling," when we look at the sins of our country, of our homes, and of our hearts, and consider how often the forbearance of God waits for, and tries the children of men, making "His rain to descend, and His sun to shine upon the unthankful and the evil." How much long-suffering was shown to the world in the days of Noah; how long a reprieve was allowed to the Amorites and to the Chaldæans; how often were overtures made to Jerusalem, that sinful city, before at length, and without remedy, the desolations came! Mercies are, indeed, causes of thankfulness; but they make impenitence more inexcusable, and sin more exceeding sinful. The mercies of God lead to repentance. "There is mercy with Him, and therefore shall He be feared."

If, on the other hand, you take the darker view of the produce of the year, and are disposed to dwell more on that which has been spoiled than on that which has been preserved, on the devastation produced by unseasonable rains, rather than on the advantages secured by intervals of sunshine and dry weather, then comes the question, "*Is there not a cause?*" In the time of the Prophet Haggai it was undoubtedly true that they had "sown much and brought in little;" that the earth was stayed from her fruits, that the corn crop failed, and that nothing prospered which the ground brought forth. The people, in the meantime, were either careless as to the true cause of this, or, looking only to natural agencies, and blaming the times and the seasons, while they were bent, as far as they were able, to take care of themselves, and to improve their own habitations, and to lift up themselves in the world, not contented to dwell as their forefathers had done, or to live as they had lived *and prospered*, but aspiring to dwell in their "ceiled houses;" and therefore it was that the prophet of God was sent with the solemn message: "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Consider your ways," and to tell them the cause of this visitation: "It is because of *mine house* that is waste, and ye run every man *to his own house*." It is because you are neglecting the sanctuary, the worship and service of your God, and are only careful for your private gain, while the reasonable cost of your religion is viewed, and treated, as a burden grievous to be borne. Your savings, therefore, in divine things have proved losses in the end; whereas, if you had cheerfully and liberally cast into the treasury of the Lord, what you had so expended would have been recompensed by a bountiful increase. In the days of Malachi, again, there was the vine casting her fruit before the time, and the devourer destroying the produce of the ground; and when the people were admonished to repent, they put the inquiry, as if unconscious of anything amiss in themselves, "Wherein shall we return?" And the answer was: "Will a man rob God; yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, wherein have we robbed thee?" And the answer was: "In tithes and in offerings." What they did give was given grudgingly, and as of necessity—the blind and the lame and the sick were such as they offered for sacrifices; and thus, as they withheld their acknowledgments from God, He, for their solemn warning, held back His blessing. And we may assure ourselves of this, that, however circumstances may change, God Himself is unchangeable, and that in His Government of the world He acts by the same laws, administers His providence on the same principles, and has caused the things of old time to be written for our warning upon whom the ends of the world are come. And again, to go back to an earlier period, when the Jews were led as captives to the waters of Babylon, and became servants to the Chaldæans, leaving their homes desolate and their city in ruins; there was then a cause, though they would not be persuaded to believe it, while it might have been to their profit to do so. It was because they had despised the messengers of God, and disregarded their counsel. And especially were they reckoned with for their continued profanation of the Sabbaths, so that each Sabbatical year neglected was brought into the account at last, and the desolation was determined for so many years, until the land had *enjoyed her Sabbaths*—"for as long as she lay desolate, she kept

Sabbath, to fulfil three score and ten years." (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.) Does it not behove us earnestly to consider, as many as take chief account of losses and hardness of the times, whether there be not *a cause in ourselves*, and whether that cause may not be found in duties towards God neglected, or grudgingly performed, as well as in trangressions of the second Table, which teaches us what we owe to our neighbour? As honesty is the best policy, so "*Godliness* hath the promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come." And here let me add a caution, far from needless, lest we charge God foolishly—a caution that we do not think it enough—that, indeed, we do not think it, if *alone*, to serve any good purpose, when the land is suffering either from the excess of rain, or parched for want of seasonable showers—to add to our ordinary public services a short collect for fair weather. Rather it behoves us to remember that all the dealings of God, especially the less common, are directly intended for a special purpose, and that His goodness and His severity—His blessed sunshine and His dismal storms—are alike intended to lead us to deeper convictions of our sinfulness and His holiness, to the humbling our souls, the searching out our errors, the purifying our hearts by faith, and the "breaking off our sins by righteousness." And if, without the consideration of the purposes of God in His visitations, we make our prayer for the removal of our burden, then we shall be answered, or not. If *no* change appear speedily, then we are exposed to the temptation to think lightly of the power of prayer, and, perhaps, to ask, with the scorners, "How doth God know, and is there knowledge in the Most High?" (Ps. lxxiii. 11.) And, on the other hand, should the evil be presently removed from us, the case may be even worse; for then the warning has been sent, and we have refused to accept it—the opportunity has been let pass—and we, instead of receiving correction, to our own great benefit, and to God's glory, have caused the sin of which we have been admonished to be deepened, instead of being cleansed—we have loved the darkness, and the light is taken from us; we have refused correction, and therefore are left to that most terrible judgment of God, to go on quietly in an evil way, and to prosper in it, not seeing the hand of God either in judgment or in mercy, and, so standing rebuked by the great Patriarch in the times of old, who wisely, and believingly, and thankfully declared: "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, and blessed be the name of the Lord."

2. We have represented to us the true disposition and conduct of a child of God in the example before us.

It was a heavy affliction with which the Shunammite was visited, when her beloved child lay dead by sunstroke in the harvest; yet, she could say "It is well." Far more grievous was old Eli's trouble, when the solemn message was brought him by the youthful Samuel, of the evils determined upon his house for the vileness of his sons; yet he could utter the language of calm resignation: "And he said, It is the Lord: let Him do what seemeth Him good." The Prophet goes further still, and, in the prospect of general desolation in the flocks, the herds, and the fields, makes the noble profession: "Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation." Stripes, imprisonment with close confinement in the noisome, lowest dungeon at Philippi, were surely sore trials of the flesh; yet could Paul and Silas, when so persecuted, "Sing praises unto God" with so hearty a voice, that the prisoners heard them." And in all these cases we may trace the echo, from generation to generation, of the Patriarch's example, when though his mantle was rent, and his head shaved, and he was himself prostrate on the ground, he yet exclaimed, bringing the treasure of praise from the inmost chamber of his heart, "Blessed be the name of the Lord."

We can easily conceive, and it is no vain imagination, circumstances in this world of *extreme* misery, for "man is born to trouble;" we can picture, and the picture will be true to life in a multitude of actual instances—we can, I say, picture to ourselves a man who has known better days, reduced to abject poverty, so that he, who had once enough to squander on his lusts, has now to eat the bread of charity, and to depend on the labour of others for his daily support. We can further suppose such an one as destitute of spiritual treasure as he is of worldly possessions, cast on shore by waves of trouble, like some wrecked voyager, ready to perish, and to perish as the beasts, uncheered by hope. Even for *such an one*, being a *living man*, in whom the breath of life still lingers, there is at least one ground of thankfulness—that he is yet within the dispensation of mercy—on earth, where the Gospel message is proclaiming pardon to the penitent, and mercy free to everyone that believeth, and absolution with a free welcome for the vilest prodigal, who will arise and go to his Father with a broken heart—thankfulness, that he is yet kept, if it be in circumstances of great misery, where there is a Saviour who came to call sinners to repentance, and that he is not beyond reach of mercy, and lifting up his eyes in hell, being in torments. Even this is a consideration of no trifling value, and such as may well call forth, even from such an one, the exclamation: "Blessed be the name of the Lord."

But, if we set before our minds a sinner in a low estate, as to all his surroundings in this world, "fightings without, and fears within," his prospects clouded, his family sinking instead of rising,—but yet a sinner penitent, believing, *saved*, reconciled, adopted of God, unto whom Christ is precious, and Heaven secured as a glorious home—this man may have, indeed, no contemptible trials to endure;

he may be known as the man who hath seen afflictions, yet in the sovereignty of God, who is the God of his salvation, and in the possession of Jesus, as the pearl of great price, he can rejoice in the midst of trials. He can say, in the words of St. Augustine, "I have lost my gold, I have lost my cattle, I have lost all my possessions, but I have not lost Him who is the gracious Giver." "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, and blessed be the name of the Lord."

And, finally, it well becomes us to remember, if prosperity attend our enterprises and our labours, that our *stewardship* involves the deepest *responsibility*: "Charge them that are rich in this world." (And this comprehends all the well to-do in their various degrees.) It will not avail a man to plead that he is not rich, when he keeps himself poor by his selfish expenses. "Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up for themselves a good foundation for the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." It is very hard to have treasure in this world, and, at the same time, to have the heart fixed steadfastly on the treasures of the world to come.

On the other hand, if *adversity* press sore upon the believer, and, whether he look to the right hand or to the left, the clouds hem him in and shut out his day, then it behoves him to consider well if there be not, in all this, some wholesome chastisement of his loving Father, to win him from some dangerous snare or easily besetting sin, to show him wherein he has offended, and to bring him back to his Father's arms. *Whatever*, in fine, our state may be—if prosperous, let us consider if there be not in that prosperity some temptation to try us; if the contrary, whether there be not a chastisement to warn us. In either case, and in every situation, let us own, as believers, the Providence of God directing all, and the sovereignty of God ruling in all. Let us in every condition "run the race set before us" with watchfulness and with prayer, and with self-denial, having always the eye of faith and love lifted up to Jesus; and then we shall be able, in all circumstances, to praise God, and to say: "The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away and blessed be the name of the Lord." Amen.

We are glad to hear that Bishop Otter's College, at Chichester, for training young ladies as elementary schoolmistresses, is flourishing. The Council, in their advertisement, offer some Exhibitions for Queen's Scholars who pass the examination in July next.

We are obliged to hold over letters from Miss Bewicke, Civis, and others, as well as papers and reviews.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

By the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge on Oct. 20th, 1881.

"But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit."—1 Cor. ii. 9, 10.

I READ over to you these words, not to attempt a long exposition of text or context, but to set out from them on a brief excursion of thought upon a subject which, at least, they powerfully suggest. That subject is the need, according to the witness of Scripture, that the human soul, if it is effectually to apprehend the power and the glory of the Gospel, should be visited and dealt with, in a sense strong and special, by an influence which, indeed—is not itself, the influence of the Holy Ghost. As regards our starting-point, the text, let me only passingly remark upon its context and its phrases. Its context is the assertion of the Apostle that there is about the Gospel a hidden wisdom, an inner truth; and that this truth was invisible to the minds of those who rejected and crucified the Saviour; for, had they seen it, they would not have crucified Him. And then comes in the text to prove that such blindness of the soul was recognised long before in the Old Scriptures, as a mystery and a fact. The blindness of those who slew the Lord did but answer to what "was written"—that solemn formula of final appeal with the Apostles and their Master. Isaiah had spoken of the acts of God in redeeming mercy as things beyond the reach of *à priori* discovery by human senses and reason and imagination. Man could receive them when revealed; there was that in man which could respond to them when revealed; but in order to that revelation there needed the action of the Divine Spirit on the spirit of man. No record of facts, no witness of phenomena, without the special action of the Holy Spirit, could bring them home upon the heart. But to Christian believers, to Paul and his disciples in that special instance, they were brought home. And it was so, not because their eyes or ears were keener than those of our Lord's executioners, or because their heart was more imaginative, but because the Holy Ghost had unveiled to them this wisdom, this esoteric wisdom and glory of the ways of God.

Such, surely, is the outline of the context. For the Apostle's quotation of the Prophet appears to refer to the whole way of salvation, and not only to the bright eternal future of the saved. The words cannot, indeed, exclude the thought of the glories of heaven, which, assuredly, senses have not seen, nor imagination either, but which God has prepared for them that love Him. But neither can they exclude the wonders of grace on earth

which equally are things of eternal plan and preparation, and which here stand nearest in connection to the previous verse. For, according to that verse, it was not ignorance of the nature of heaven, but ignorance of the nature of the law from heaven, which allowed the crucifixion. It was, above all things, ignorance of Him. Not ignorance of His existence, nor of a supernatural something that lay around Him, for these were things of admitted fact; but ignorance of Him. It was a failure of the soul, somehow or other, to grasp the "hidden wisdom" of His nature and His work. In short, the Apostle's citation of the passage or passages of the Prophet appears to bear upon the glorious total of redeeming mercy; not only, or mainly, upon glory, but also, and mainly, upon grace; as indeed it is the way of Scripture to bind the two everywhere into one strong series, and always to throw more emphasis and more illumination upon grace than upon glory; for grace is always less attractive to the imagination and always more needful to the will.

The discovery of the ways of grace, then, had been beyond the reach of senses and of mind. "The salvation which is in Christ Jesus" had not entered into the human heart, any more than it had been used to shine visibly upon human eyes or pour music into human ears. The apprehension of it needed to be conveyed in upon the soul by the eternal Spirit. And by Him to the Apostle and to his brethren, it had been so conveyed, "God revealed them unto us by His Spirit."

One further remark, and one only, on the details of the text. What is the personal reference of the word "us"—"God hath revealed them unto us"? The reference must lie not to the Apostle or Apostles exclusively, but to the saints at large. The context leads naturally this way. For the "hidden wisdom," once hid but now revealed, of which the Christian teacher spoke among his mature, or "perfect" hearers, has just been described as "fore-ordained before the world unto our glory"; the glory, certainly not of the teachers only, but of the believing community. And again, those who have received the revelation of it are contrasted, not with a lower grade of believers, but just with the unilluminated enemies and judicial murderers of the Lord of Glory. Not the limited influence, then, which we describe as apostolic inspiration, but a work of the Holy One, within the consciousness of all true believers, is at least mainly in question here. For the saints, as such, Paul claims that this has happened; the wonder and splendour of redeeming grace, invisible to the senses and out of the reach of independent thought, has in the ideal state of the case been unveiled to them by God through His Spirit.

I have endeavoured, almost anxiously, to clear up what seems to me to be the main reference of the text. But I have no anxiety about what I would point to now, the large concurrent witness of the New Testament to the truth which I take to be the main business of the text. Full and strong is the voice of the Gospel to this effect, that the power and the glory of its disclosures, their reality, their certainty, the majesty of their importance, the urgency of their needfulness, the repose of the hope of the Gospel, and the animation of it, too, if the heart is to apprehend them effectually, must be brought home to that heart by an influence, by a visitation, by a visitor and teacher, who, indeed, is not the heart itself. God must unveil them through His Spirit.

Pass briefly with me over some of the many passages of the sacred Word which bear this way. And suffer me to ask my brethren to look at them in their own directness and simplicity. Hear them as we would wish to hear Him who inspired the utterance of them. Hear them not through the medium of interpretation, however venerable; or system, however vast and subtle. God forbid I should slight, by a whisper even, antiquity of belief and precision of system. But of this we may be sure about antiquity and about system, that neither of them is for one moment meant to take the edge off the Divine Word in its application to the inmost conscience and the individual will. Church theory, to allude to that for a moment, was never meant to strike aside the sword of the Spirit. Calculation of what constitutes Church membership, and the judgments of charity as to who actually are Church members, were never meant to check the self-examination of the soul, as it turns inward with a judgment which dares not be that of charity, for it is the scrutiny of self upon self, and asks itself if the spirit-searching words of the Lord and the Apostles are echoed by regenerate reality within. Then listen to the words of the Son of God Himself, and let in their whole appeal upon your soul. "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God; every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Me." "The world cannot receive the Spirit of Truth, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; but ye know Him." "He that hath My commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me; and he that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him, and," ponder well the closing promise, "will manifest Myself to him." "Lord," inquires an Apostle, in his perplexity thinking of a manifestation which eyes could see, and which could enter readily enough into the heart of man, "Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us and not unto the world?" And ponder well again that great response of the Lord. He has nothing to say about Apostolic inspiration, which was a thing apart altogether; He has everything to say about the inner history of the individual believer's soul, and about a divine indwelling in that soul: "If a

man love Me, he will keep My words, and My Father will love him, and We will come unto him and make our abode with him." I entreat again, as in the presence of our Lord, the whole attention of soul and conscience to those words. They are for us here and now. There is no fragment of a pretext here for tying down the speaker's intention to an exceptional time, to an age of Apostles, and of miracles, of tongues, and prophecies, and healings. There is no excuse, again, for the thought that the great facts of ecclesiastical ordinance and order, things in themselves most weighty, are to the main point here at all. The question is of an individual experience. The conditions are love to the Redeemer and the keeping of His words. Here is a promise of direct divine influence, and of distinct personal experience, and a promise for all time and for all true disciples.

And how perfectly in harmony this is with the narrative of the Acts and with the Epistles and the Apocalypse. From the Acts take one example. You read of Paul's first work in Europe. He sits teaching on a certain Sabbath by the side of the river at Philippi amidst the circle of female worshippers; and we are informed of one conversion; Lydia believed and was baptized. What had happened in her soul? No mere reception of information, however authentic, nor of inferences, however cogent; but an inner influence from God: "Her heart the Lord opened, to attend to the things spoken." Here, again, is a case fully in point to our inquiry of to-day. It is a case for all time. The element of miracle, in the ordinary sense, which might have seemed to restrict its significance to an exceptional period, is wholly absent. Lydia witnessed no miracle before conversion that we read of, nor wrought a miracle afterwards. Nothing could have been more perfectly natural in its externals than that conversion. But from the point of view of Scripture it was supernatural as well. To be sure, Lydia listened with her own ears and reflected with her own mind and accepted with her own will; let us be very sure of that; but her inner being was influenced towards the Gospel, and made conscious of its glory, by a power not her own; it was God, revealing through the Spirit. And the very simplicity of the narrative, and the *obiter dictum* of this remarkable feature in it, commend this case to the inquirer into the ways of salvation as a wide-reaching example. The heart that attends, effectually attends, to the things which God has prepared for them that love Him, does not for one moment cease to be itself; it never thinks and feels with faculties, so to speak, imported and injected, if such things could be; no, but its perceptions and feelings take the divinely healthy line they do, thanks to a Divine Power, strong and special, which has been at work upon the inner world; "that heart, the Lord has opened."

Pass to the Epistles, and you find the same indications of this celestial phenomenon, this immortal flower in the lower wilderness, the direct influence of God, through His Spirit, upon the soul, revealing the glory of the things prepared. We read, in a well-known context, that "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God." Yes, the conscious utterance upward of the filial love of the believing soul is met, not by an echo from the desert rocks, the mere reflection of its own self, but by a voice, downward, divinely independent, conveying assurances of the paternal Love of Him that is invisible. We find indeed the divine influence, in this passage, present on both sides of that blessed intercourse, for it is the Spirit, we read, in the believer's heart that actuates the profound cry, "Abba, Father!" and it is the Spirit, in answer to that cry, Whoso "sheds abroad" the love of God in the heart (to use the words of another passage not far off), as to make it sure with an indescribable intuition that that cry is met, as well as prompted, by eternal kindness. Just so it is, in the words close to the text, "We have received the Spirit which is from God, that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God." Just so it is again, in the words of the great companion Epistle: "God shined in our hearts, to give the light to the lightening up of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." In the Ephesian epistle, as we might expect from its exalted tone of spiritual instruction and appeal, there is passage upon passage to our purpose. And observe here again, the language leaves them open for perpetual application, for the attention and experience of every age of the Church; not a hint, not a shadow of a hint anywhere appears that what we know as miraculous gifts are in the Apostle's intentions here. All, all, is of the soul, the affections, the will, the experience of the disciple; all bears upon the believer as such, not on the believer as a witness or as a worker of superhuman signs. Do you not recall that prayer of the great missionary for his converts? "I make mention of you in my prayers, that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and of revelation in the knowledge of Him," and then the prayer runs on into glorious detail: "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that you may know what is the hope of this calling, and what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe." I deliberately quote at full length. All this, and nothing less than this, is the prayer of this inspired shepherd for His flock. It is a prayer for influences direct and divine upon their faculties of thought and affection and imagination. It implores for them that things already known, and truly known, and to no ordinary degree either—or the tone of the whole Epistle is beside the mark—may be known so very far better in

respect of grasp and realization and sacred joy, as that the access of knowledge shall seem, to what went before, to be the first opening of dark eyes. "I beseech Thee, show them Thy glory; make Thy goodness pass before them." That which eye had not seen, nor had it entered into the heart to conceive, was to be revealed to the Ephesian Christian by God through the Spirit, if Paul's prayer was answered. But there is a passage, if possible, richer and deeper still in the third chapter of this same celestial letter—this letter of which, I think it has been said it moves, as it were, with the wide sweep of angelic wings and, essaying ever and again to touch the earth in the details of precept, is wafted ever and again aloft in the region of the eternal truths. It is an often quoted passage, but who can hear such words too often? "I bow my knees unto the Father." Yes, see the old Apostle kneeling in his Roman lodging, and listen, as perhaps sometimes the Prætorian sentinel with astonished curiosity listened, to such words going up from human lips to an unseen but living Sanctity; "I bow my knees unto the Father, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might through His Spirit in your inner man, that Christ may take up His dwelling through faith in your hearts; that being rooted and grounded in love you may be invigorated to grasp, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ." Is this the turgid effusion of a rhetorician at his exercises? No, it is the well-weighed intercession of an Apostle. It is the utterance of the chosen vessel and it carries with it the authentications of his Master. And it asks at large for this same supernatural influence upon the inmost realities of perceptions and affections and will. Not for exceptional saints, but for all true disciples to whom those presents should come, it supplicates that God through His Spirit would so interpose amidst the workings of the inner man that the Saviour, already known indeed and loved and served, might yet take such a developed possession of the soul that it might be likened to the first arrival of the Prince at His permanent abode. And the thought of the Apostle at Ephesus is echoed by the utterance of the Lord Himself, in His glory, to the seer at Patmos; "I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me."

I have grouped together a large miscellany of Scriptures—large, yet most inadequate to the completeness of the subject. And I am perfectly and anxiously aware how much more was to be said, even in barest outline, upon each one; and again how passage differs from passage in certain respects of application; how some, for example, deal with the first step of the unveiling work, and how others, and those the majority, deal with its after stages. But I claim for all my quotations that they are to the point, so far as this, at least, that they present to us, as a ruling phenomenon of the Gospel, that it offers openly and amply to the soul of man, to the soul inquiring and to the soul believing, the grant of an interposition, a visitation, a visitor, eternal and divine; able, infinitely able, to touch, and to adjust, and to illuminate the whole inner world, and to bring the man acquainted not in theory but in experience, not in covenant but in realization, which is a different matter, with the things of God's grace which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor heart conceived; with the glory of Christ, with the peace of God, with the guidance of the Spirit, with the personal prospect, the solid, sober, but most blissful prospect, of the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. These Scriptures, these wonderful Scriptures, all with one voice imply that this influence is profoundly needed; that though man's thought, affections, conscience and will, are perfectly real, yet they are hopelessly inadequate, by the depravity and the distortion of the Fall, to grasp by their united efforts the realities of the Grace of God.

These Scriptures all with one voice testify on the other hand that the Celestial Influence they offer, when it works indeed, will work not by the intrusion of new faculties and by His action through those faculties in the soul, but by the indwelling of the Divine Guest amidst the original faculties; and by His action through those faculties; and that, therefore, the humble aspirant for this great gift of God will not indolently wait for a sudden sensation of new powers, which shall supersede his watching and his will, but will nerve himself to watch and to will all the more diligently while he prays, because it is through nature that the supernatural will exert itself. "God will work," not out of us but "in us," and so will work as that *we* shall will, and *we* shall see, and *we* shall love. Yet meanwhile, to return to our first and main theme, the worker will so have it that the soul shall own that a power not itself is in the matter; that a hand not its own has drawn the veil and manifested Christ.

I have designedly been silent on many a question that pressed in from the outside for notice. I have sought reverently to avoid, so far as possible, questions about the mode of conveyance of special grace upon which believers in Revelation may not agree. I have omitted, less intentionally, to point out the profound difference, in the idea of Scripture, between conscience which is universal, and grace which is special, and of which the supremely special work is to bring the soul into contact with its Redeemer.

No, my aim has been throughout to collect and present together some large fragment at least of the Scripture testimony to some such propositions as these:—

That the human soul, without a special divine assistance, is helpless to know God, with that inner knowledge which is life eternal;

That such an assistance is a revealed reality, permanent, accessible, and profoundly desirable;

That there is indeed a Holy Ghost, and an illumination of the Holy Ghost; and that the Eternal Father indeed gives, as He has promised to give, His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him.

"*To them that ask Him.*" Brethren, I venture, before I close, to point to those sacred words. Even in this venerable place the preacher dares not be less than an ambassador for Christ. He must appeal, in the name of his Master, to conscience, affection, will; and so I will even do. We have reviewed the utterances of Christ and of His saints on a very great subject. The exposition may again and again have gone astray, as of course it was inadequate throughout. But have not the divine words themselves left at least a golden residuum of infinitely desirable truth and life? And are there any here who, whatever may be their theory of religion and of its ordinances, at least know that nothing in their experience answers to this illumination upon Christ and God and Heaven, and who do own to themselves that it would be well, if it is to be had, to have it? I appeal to you not to silence that admission. I ask you not to accept a lower substitute for the divine reality, for such it is, of the thing you fain would have. I beseech you to take the words of the Sermon on the Mount, and give them a trial; "He shall give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him." How the answer will come, I do not know. It may come like the lightning. It may come like the dawn. It may come to you as it came, not many years ago, to a famous scholar at Oxford, with a sudden but permanent impression in the midst of books and studies of the overwhelming reality of eternal things. It may come as it came, to a deeply earnest but not yet enlightened Anglican pastor a century ago, with a sudden sense of wonder at those words on the page of the Greek Testament, τὸν ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτον τοῦ χριστοῦ, the unsearchable riches of Christ. It may come first, as some men know it can come, in the merciful anguish of conviction. It may come, as it has come to others, in such a "rush of love to God and Christ" as Arnold felt in his closing days, or as Zinzendorf felt when he looked in the midst of his brilliant youth on that picture of the Crucifixion. It may come, it will come and will work, ultimately, if it is real, in the strong progress of a life lived in daily patience by faith in the Son of God, in an animation to every duty, in an elixir poured into the inmost will, in a light upon the written word, upon precept as well as promise, shed from the realised presence of a living Saviour. It may come in this way or in that. But, however, it will come. It is real, it is promised. Though it tarry, wait for it, not in indolence but in diligence, wait for it. For the Father, as the Son has promised, shall give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1881.

ABLE AND WILLING—AN ADDRESS TO CHILDREN.

By the Rev. F. PEEL, Vicar of Heslington, York.

My Dear Children,—I am going to speak to you for a little while this afternoon, on one of the texts of Scripture you have learned during the past month. It is written in the eighth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, and the second verse:—"*Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.*" Let me hear you say it all together, and then try and keep it well in your minds while I say a few words to you about it. Who was it said, "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst"? Was it not a leper who came to Jesus with an earnest desire to be healed of his loathsome disease? Yes, it was. And do you know why he came to Jesus in preference to any other physician? Because he believed that He alone could cure him. Two things, then, you see, brought him to Jesus. One was his longing desire to be made well again, and the other his faith or belief in the power of Jesus to make him well. Yes, and the same two things should bring everyone else to Him—little boys and girls, as well as grown-up people. But it is not so much about the leper himself that I wish to speak to-day, as about what he said. Repeat to me again, children, what the leper said to Jesus. "Lord, if Thou *wilt*, Thou *canst* make me clean." Now if you look carefully at these simple words, you will find two which seem to include the whole. Which are they? Think a moment. "*Wilt*" and "*canst*," that's right. We often hear people say to each other—"*You can if you will.*" I dare say you have often said it yourselves. And it is as if the leper had said to Jesus—"You *can* if you *will*. I know you are *able* if you are *willing*." The leper soon found out to his great joy that Jesus was both *able* AND *willing*. And all those who wish to be like Jesus should be *willing* to do what they are *able* to do. Everybody in the church this afternoon, you and I and all the people are, I feel sure, able to do something to please God, and we should be ready and *willing* to do it cheerfully and heartily.

But, sad to say, there are many, *very* many, I fear, both here and elsewhere, who are *not* at all *willing* to do what they *can*, either for God, or for their fellow-men. This is indeed sad to think of, and sadder still to know that there always have been such persons; and some are even mentioned in the Bible. Perhaps you can tell me the names of some who were certainly

I. *Able*, but not *willing* to do a good act.

Let me help you. Do you remember reading abou

a man who "went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves," who stripped him, wounded him, and left him half dead? Very well. Now who was the first person to pass by that way, and see the poor helpless traveller lying by the roadside? A certain priest, was it not? And what did the Priest do? He passed by on the other side. How unkind! I think he must have been *able* to do something for the unfortunate man, however little; but he was *not willing*. Nor did the second passer-by behave any better. A Levite, we are told, came and looked on him, and then passed by on the other side. Surely both these men could have done some little act of love, or spoken a few kind words to the wounded traveller; but no, they were *not willing*.

But there is another instance in the New Testament, much worse than either of these. I mean the case of Pontius Pilate, the Roman Governor. When Jesus was brought before him for trial, he found no fault in Him at all. Why then did he not let Jesus go? He was *able* to do so, for he had the power of life and death in his own hands. Yes, he was *able*, but he was not *willing*. And so we might find many other examples of the like kind; but let us in the second place see if we can find any who are *willing*, but not *able*.

II. (1) S. John tells us of a lame man who sat constantly by the pool of Bethesda, hoping some day to be the first to step in after the troubling of the water, and thus have his lameness cured. But he could not. For while he was coming, another stepped down before him. He was quite *willing*, you see, to get into the Pool, but he was not *able*. (2) And in the 18th chapter of S. Luke's gospel we read of a blind man who sat by the wayside begging, and hearing that Jesus of Nazareth was passing, he called out loudly, "Jesus, have mercy on me." He would have gone to Jesus without delay, but he could not for two reasons. First, because he was blind; and secondly, because of the multitude of people in the way. He also was *willing*, you see, but not *able* to get to Jesus. He had to be brought, and then he got what he wished for. (3) But perhaps you would like me to give you an illustration not found in the Bible. Some years ago a party of young people went for a row on the river, and from some cause or other the boat was upset and the party drowned. A lady and gentleman walking along the river side were the only persons near at the time; but they could give no assistance, since the man could not swim and the lady could only wring her hands and scream for help in vain. They were indeed both *willing* to do much, but they were not *able*.

III. Now, thirdly, we have to speak of those who are both *able and willing*. They are the most useful persons, although perhaps not the most plentiful. (1) You will remember one I daresay, in connection with the man who fell among the thieves. Not every one who passed that way took no notice of the injured man. No, there was one who went up to him, and did all he could to help him, and to comfort him. Who was that? The good Samaritan. Yes. And why was he called the *good* Samaritan? Because he was *able* to do a good act, and *willing* to do it. Moreover, he showed both his willingness and ability by doing it. And his good example has been held up by Jesus Christ himself for all Christian people to imitate. Let us try then and do likewise. (2) You will not have forgotten either about the lame man, whom Peter and John saw lying at the Beautiful gate of the temple one afternoon when they went together there to pray. How the poor man looked at them, expecting they would give him something. But Peter had no money to give. Still he had something which no money could buy, and he was *willing* to give it, and he gave it to the lame man, who immediately stood and walked, and entered with them into the temple to praise God. (3) One more example and then I have done. Who was that of Whom we read that "He went about doing good?" It was Jesus. We have kept the best till last. There was nothing that He loved more than to be doing all the good He could. He never minded how much trouble He took for others. He lived for others, and at last died for others. A noble life was the life of Jesus. And although He left us an example that we should follow His steps, yet we cannot do all that He did. We cannot bring the dead to life, make the dumb to speak, the deaf to hear, the blind to see, or the lame to walk. No; He was able to do all good things, and *willing* to do them. Still there are many things we can do, for the good God has given even the very least of us the power to do something, and He expects us to use that power for good purposes. If we do not use it, He may take it away from us altogether. You know what Jesus says in one of His parables, "Take therefore the talent from him." That was because he had not used it.

Here, then, dear children, are a few lessons for you to take home with you, which if you put into practice will make you both happy and useful. (1) *Do* what you *can* for others cheerfully and willingly. Do the most you can, not the least you may. For God expects the *most* from us, not the least. (2) *Give* of what you have to those who need. It need not be money. St. Peter had no money to give to the lame man, but he gave him what he had, and that is all you are expected to do. A kind look, a kind word, or a little kind help to one who needs it, and all for love to God who has done so much for you, will not lose its reward. Try my dear children from this day, to copy the example of all the Able and Willing ones, especially the example of Jesus, and ask Him in your prayers to help you, that you may grow up into what He greatly loves to see—good and useful Christian men and women.

Reviews and Notices.

"A CHARGE," delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, at his Eleventh Visitation, August, 1881, by Alfred Ollivant, D.D., Bishop of Llandaff. London: Rivingtons. 1881. Pp. 88.

It is no disparagement of this "Charge" to say that its value and interest mainly depend on the age and experience of its venerable author, the years of whose episcopate, as well as of his life, exceed those of any other member of the Anglican bench. As we read it we feel that it is almost from the threshold of the other world that he addresses his clergy, and urges them solemnly to weigh their responsibilities, and ask themselves what manner of men they are, when judged by the standard set before them in holy Scripture. The controversies which now disturb the internal unity of the Church, or rage round its relations to the civil Government and national sovereignty, seem to retire into the back ground, and give place to a strain of

fatherly admonition such as could only issue from the lips of one in whom

> Old experience doth attain
> To something of prophetic strain.

The "Charge" consists of three separate addresses, of which the first may be characterised as hortatory, and the second as diocesan; while the third takes a wider scope, and is occupied with enforcing certain "considerations that ought firmly to be grasped by every one who embarks upon the troubled sea of theological controversy." For general readers the last is naturally the most interesting portion; but in each of the former we find a remark that we gladly transfer to our pages. Of these the first regards the performance of Divine Service. "May I suggest," says the Bishop, "how much our mode of reading the beautiful services of our Church, and the portions of Holy Scripture that are embodied in them, may have to do with the alternative of a good or bad congregation, especially in reference to poor and uneducated people. Unless they hear and understand, it cannot be to them a reasonable service. If a clergyman is so rapid that it is difficult for his hearers mentally to keep up with him, or so slow and monotonous as to weary his fellow-worshippers by his dulness, how can he expect that they will make no complaints, &c.? Who can wonder if they should prefer the extempore, and to them intelligible prayer of the meeting-house to the unintelligible services of the Church?" A long experience convinces us of the need of this remonstrance. The continual repetition of the Liturgy is but too apt to betray the minister into reading it perfunctorily and monotonously, without any perceptible savour of impressiveness or reverence. We lately heard it remarked of a highly-esteemed London clergyman, as something quite exceptional, that he always read the prayers as carefully and earnestly as if it were for the first time, and with such a manifest fervour as almost to constrain everyone to pray them with him. On the other hand, we have not seldom been tempted to ask if it had ever occurred to the reader, to whom we were listening, to recollect that the words which streamed from his lips with such a careless, irreverent nonchalance, were really addressed to the All-holy God. Of course we do not want spouting and pomposity; but a careful and reverent utterance, in harmony with the solemn realities of prayer, is indispensable, and is within the power of all. We are not sure that the taste for monotone has not acted injuriously on the devout and impressive rendering of the Liturgy in many of our Churches.

The remark which we take from the second address has regard to the duty of the clergy to stir up the laity in their parishes to do their part in sustaining and extending the work of the Church. "Let me recommend," says the Bishop, "every incumbent to form in his parish an association of the lay members of the Church, who may make it their business to interest others in all matters that concern its welfare. Even if there should be only one true-hearted Churchman in his parish—let that one be asked manfully to come forward and set an example. If there be two or more, so much the better. Only let them set to work, and and not content themselves without some practical effort to promote the interests of the Church." We are sure that the prospects of the Anglican Church both at home and abroad depend largely on the degree in which its lay members are aroused to make sacrifices for its efficiency. The long possession of great endowments has formed within the Church a habit of relying on external aid, which contrasts disadvantageously with the vigorous *self-help* of the Nonconformists. Many a complaint of this reaches us from the Colonial Bishops and clergy, who find themselves distanced in the occupation of new territories by outside organizations, whose members necessity has long trained to give liberally for the maintenance and spread of their sect. Let the laity vigorously "put their shoulders to the wheel," and the Church will have nothing to fear from competition.

Coming now to the last of the three addresses, we are struck by some shrewd remarks aimed at the prevalent disposition to rush into controversy. A large body of the clergy seem to the Bishop to imagine that they have "a roving and chivalrous commission to do battle on every occasion that may happen to arise with a supposed adversary to their own theological opinions." Such are advised "not to interfere with theological disputations until they have specially qualified themselves for the task," and are warned that "popular and pious ideas upon deep and critical questions are not always safe or sufficient guides." The younger clergy especially are urged "to think twice before they venture to speak, if ever they feel themselves inclined to dip their pens in gall, or to open their lips on a declamatory platform"; and to remember that "the passionate or contemptuous expressions or sneers, with which we are too familiar, are often the mere shelter of ignorance." Proceeding in the same line, the Bishop protests against the existence of the "two unauthorised and irresponsible associations within our Communion," to the action of which he ascribes "a great deal of the bitter feeling that has unhappily prevailed amongst us," namely, the English Church Union, and the Church Association; and winds up with the emphatic declaration: "Better far would it be, in my opinion, for the Church, as a spiritual body, which has the promise of the perpetual presence of her Divine Master, and may look for His guidance and support so long as she is humbly casting her care upon God, to tolerate the very largest diversity of opinion or practice—short of everything but deadly heresy, in which case of course we must be faithful even unto death—than to invoke the aid of such unexampled combinations." Alas! that this should be but "the voice of one crying in the the wilderness!"

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

Sir,—I am very much indebted to Rev. T. G. Bonney for his letter, also to your other correspondents for their sympathy and views; their letters I think show that the subject is one of general interest desirable to be discussed; I shall therefore ask you to permit me to state at some length a few further thoughts about it.

While the general answer given by Professor Bonney fully explains some difficulties, namely those which arise from the imperfect observation of those who lived in past ages, it appears to me to fail as an

explanation in the case alluded to. I conceive all must believe that the object of the writer of Gen. i, ii, iii., was to set forth God as the Creator and Orderer of all things, and to let us know somewhat of the order in which He made all things.

To say that this account may have been merely a statement of opinion current when Genesis was written, and may have been contrary to fact, is to my mind very startling, and inconsistent with what appears to me the object of that part of Scripture; the statement may be incomplete, but if it be contrary to fact it will necessitate very different views of Scripture from those generally held, and which I as yet hold.

Moreover, it may be asked how such opinions could have been current at that age? Where did they come from? How did they arise? Not from observation, for no man, according to Genesis, was present to witness the works of the first five days. Not from observation and reasoning in after days, for, as Professor Bonney says, "the age of the Mosaic record was the world's infancy in science"; such opinions therefore must have arisen either from imagination or revelation; if from imagination, it is strange that its grand simplicity and order presents such a contrast to the opinions current among heathen nations regarding the origin of the earth and its inhabitants; it is strange also that the currency of an ill-founded opinion regarding the order in which all were made should be spoken of as it is in the Fourth Commandment. To build an exhortation on what the builder knew was an imaginary fact, and not a real one, strikes me as very strange, and as an explanation we should be very slow to adopt. It appears to me more likely that it was from revelation that opinion became current; a revelation doubtless "couched in human language," but describing a Creation, an order pursued by The Creator, and a cessation of work on His part.

I wish now to refer to the particular answer given by Professor Bonney. I must re-state the difficulty on the evolution hypothesis; it is needful to preface it by saying that my knowledge of such subjects has arisen from dipping into lectures, reviews, sermons, the particulars of which cannot be distinctly recalled, but which have left certain impressions on my mind, and raised certain questions as with others, which call for answers if such be possible.

The evolution hypothesis I take to be this (if I am mistaken in its statement I am sure Rev. T. G. Bonney will correct me), that the present species of animals have been evolved from animals of a lower order by a natural process of development, that this process of development or evolution has been going on for millions of years, that it is going on still, and that the laws which we see acting now, and in accordance with which a variety of individual life is produced, are sufficient to account for all species arising out of the first form of life on this earth.

This hypothesis implies there has been no break in the order from the commencement of the series; and therefore that there can have been no such thing as the production of animals by God's appointment for a certain number of periods and then a cessation of such a course of production, and yet this, viz., a certain course of action for a time, and then a cessation, is plainly affirmed in Gen. i., ii., and in Fourth Commandment. I fail to see how the particular answer of Professor Bonney meets this difficulty.

To me, with my present knowledge, it appears that the hypothesis of evolution (if I understand it aright) is irreconcileable with Scripture; it appears to me also that it is opposed to observation and experience, because we do not see gradations of living animals as they move up from one species to another. How is it that this process, if going on, is undiscernible in existing animal life, or in geological remains? If the evolution hypothesis were true, should we not see not merely *possible* tokens of change from one species, but *palpable* tokens of *numberless* changes in animal life in *all directions* as they ascend from one species to another.

To my own judgment the evolution hypothesis is contrary to Scripture and experience, though my confidence in my own opinion is shaken when I see divines and scientific men speaking of it as if possibly true, and thereby raising the difficulty which on that hypothesis I think still needs a further answer.

RICHARD GALBRAITH.

LOCALISATION OF EDUCATION.

SIR,—I shall be extremely obliged if through your columns you will kindly allow me to ventilate two points which, to my mind, work adversely to Board and other schools, and country parishes, as at present existing under the Acts and Revised Code.

1. It is a very difficult matter to get children who can be made useful in field and household work to attend school regularly, and even in many instances when they have passed the standard.

2. They cannot be obtained in order that they may make up one hundred and fifty attendances required by the Education Department.

According to the present regulations every child is compelled to attend school between the ages of five and ten, and most people, even recalcitrant parents, must deem the latter age quite young enough for a child to be set to regular work. If at that age they might be allowed to go to work without any restriction, saying nothing about standards (but allowing them to work on in an ordinary course) and bye-laws, which are a bugbear in the eyes of the labouring classes, leaving it to the parents whether or not the child should remain longer at school; it would be conferring a great boon upon agricultural districts, and also prevent much annoyance and ill-feeling from "summoning."

2. In country districts the population at Lady-Day and Michaelmas is of a very migratory nature, and frequently children are removed from one parish to another. Up to the present attendances made at one school could not be transferred or counted at another, so that numbers of children annually could not be examined and so pass up from standard to standard, and be made free according to the Code.

This works hardly for the poorer classes, as it frequently necessitates children remaining longer at school than would be required if attendance made at one school could be counted in another, if caused by the removal of the parent or guardian from one parish to another.

In the new Code, which comes into operation next year, it is said children removing from parish to parish may for the future be examined in their new school if they have been a half-year in attendance at it, thus saving time which now is wasted; this is granting no boon, as all children who have been in attendance six months will be examined. Now as a

plain matter of fact, if all children attended school between the ages of five and ten, all bother about standards, bye-laws, etc., etc., would be done away with, the children would receive quite as good an education as they do now, and parents would, at least as a general rule, be satisfied.

If members of school boards and managers of schools would take the matter up, I am sure something might be done to obviate many annoyances which now take place.

PETER ROYSTON.

Coates Rectory, Whittlesea, 23rd Nov., 1881.

DISTRICT OF STRETE.

SIR,—As churchwarden for the district of Strete, in the parish of Blackawton, Devon, I wish, in justification of myself, to say I have no power or funds to provide services in our church. The church is shut up; there have been no offerings collected for the poor for months, as there has been no Holy Communion administered in the Church since Trinity Sunday, when there was one service at 9 a.m. There is no one to visit the poor, sick, and infirm, or see to the education of the children. We have collections for Missions at home and abroad, but here is a mission close to our own doors urgently calling for help.

LEWIS P. MADDEN.

Sil-Amchadha, Strete, Dartmouth, Nov. 22, 1881.

"HAGAR," BY M. D.

SIR,—In order that those who have read in last issue your naturally partial review of "Hagar," by M. D., may have a means of determining the value of a claim which rests upon the practices (polygamy and concubinage) having been "positively recognised and allowed in that Code of Laws which is declared to have been delivered to Moses by the Lord Jehovah," I beg to suggest that the Rev. Charles Voysey permit you to print in the PULPIT Parts II. and III. of his "Lectures on the Bible," published in Vol. V. of "The Sling and the Stone." I do not hesitate in suggesting this because both you and Mr. Voysey have invariably shown yourselves desirous to make any sacrifice in the interest of truth.

Upon the frequent use in the Old Testament of such solemn phrases as "Thus saith the Lord," "and God said," "God spake these words and said;" allow me here to quote some very instructive facts given by Sir Samuel Baker in his book on the "Nile Tributaries." He says (Pp. 129, 131), "The conversation of the Arabs is in the exact style of the Old Testament. The name of God is coupled with every trifling incident in life. Should a famine afflict the country, it is expressed in the stern language of the Old Testament: 'The Lord has sent a grievous famine upon the land,' or 'The Lord called for a famine and it came upon the land.' Should their cattle fall sick, it is considered to be an affliction by Divine command; or should the flocks prosper and multiply, the prosperity is attributed to Divine interference. This striking likeness to the descriptions of the Old Testament is most interesting to a traveller when living among these people. With the Bible in one hand, and these unchanged tribes before the eyes, there is a thrilling illustration of the sacred records; the past becomes the present; the veil of three thousand years is raised, and the living picture is a witness to the exactness of the historical description. At the same time there is a light thrown upon many obscure passages in the Old Testament by the experience of the present customs and figures of speech of the Arabs, which are exactly like those that were practised at the periods described. Should the present history of the country be written by an Arab scribe, the style of the description would be purely that of the Old Testament, and the various calamities, or the good fortunes that have, in the course of nature, befallen both the tribes and individuals would be recounted either as special visitations of Divine wrath or blessings for good deeds performed. If in a dream a particular course of action is suggested, the Arab believes that God has *spoken* and directed him. The Arab scribe or historian would describe the event as the '*voice* of the Lord' having spoken unto the person; or that God appeared to him in a dream and '*said*,' &c. Thus much allowance would be necessary on the part of a European reader for the figurative ideas and expressions of the people."

Nov. 22nd, 1881. BROADCHURCH.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beeby, Rev. Charles Evans, curate of St. Leonard's, Bridgnorth; vicar of Yardley Wood.
Bevan, Rev. Claudius Barclay, curate of Diss, Norfolk.
Blosse, Rev. R. C. Lynch, vicar of Coaley.
Brown, Rev. James Cassels, curate of Liverpool; vicar of Ditton.
Cooper, Rev. Winfield, incumbent of St. John-the-Evangelist; Copthorne, Sussex.
Dixon, Rev. Beaufort Harkness, curate of St. Peter, Worcester; vicar of Studley.
Elliott, Rev. W. Foster, rector of Little Chart, Kent; incumbent of Grosvenor Chapel, South Audley-street, London.
Farbrother, Rev. Alfred, curate of St. Mary-the-Less, Lambeth; vicar of Leysdown, Kent.
Farmer, Rev. John Prior, vicar of Branksea, Dorset.
Greaves, Rev. Henry Ley, incumbent of St. Andrew's, Aberdeen; incumbent of Kincardine O'Neil, and chaplain of Glen Tana, Aberdeenshire.
Harwood, Rev. Reynold, chaplain of Lucas's Hospital, Wokingham.
Hichens, Rev. Baron, vicar of Ottershaw.
Hutchins, Rev. C. G., rector of Dunton; inspector of schools in the Rural Deanery of Mursley, Diocese of Oxford.
Hutchons, Rev. James, curate of Quebec Chapel; vicar of St. Barnabas, Marylebone.
Linton, Rev. H., vicar of St. Paul's, Birkenhead; vicar of St. Mary, Birkenhead.
Morse, Rev. C. W., incumbent of Christ Church, Yankalilla, and of St. James', Glenburn, Adelaide, South Australia; honorary canon of St. Peter's Cathedral, Adelaide.
Nation, Rev. C. C., senior curate of St. Mary's, Beverley; vicar of All Saints', Pontefract.
Stephens, Rev. Horace, curate of Tattenhall; minor canon of Chester Cathedral, with charge of the Choristers.
Waters, Rev. F. E., curate of Stoke-on-Trent; vicar of Hope, Hanley.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hutton, Rev. William, for thirty-seven years vicar of Beetham, Westmoreland, after only two days' illness, at Beetham House, on the 20th ult., aged 76.

SUPPLEMENT.

Vol. XII.—No. 310. SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1881.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—The "Army of Occupation," if I may be allowed that definition of the beneficed clergy, would give one incumbent to an area of four square miles, taking England and Wales as the basis of the calculation, and leave an additional square mile to each licensed curate. Or, including the beneficed and licensed clergy in one enumeration, each worker would have allotted to him an area of three square miles. There would then be one beneficed clergyman to over 1,700 souls in England and Wales, as the average population per square mile is 430; or if all the ordained clergy returned in the "Clergy Lists," including the unattached, Colonials, those engaged in the scholastic profession, the clergy in Scotland and Ireland returned in "Crockford," together with deacons and unlicensed priests, and not omitting those whose names—owing to death, superannuation, or resignation—ought not to appear in the current year's Lists, there would be one clergyman to every 1,100 souls (not including those in holy orders, of course). If the enumeration be rigidly restricted to those who hold the bishop's license, the proportion will be one worker to nearly 1,300 souls.* These statistics will enable your readers to judge for themselves whether the "Army of Occupation" is equal to the work assigned to it. This calculation would assign, in addition, an area of one square mile to each clergyman not included in the Annual Diocesan Returns to the Privy Council, and therefore, it is to be assumed, engaged in no active work in the Church.

I was led into these calculations in consequence of the references one is so frequently coming upon in the floating literature of the day to the failure of the Church to evangelise the masses. But I notice in the last issue of the PULPIT a tendency to confuse the province of the Church with that of the State; a want of discrimination between the conditions on which each respectively can best promote the public good; a failure to distinguish between the *modus operandi* of a spiritual organization and the working of the "powers that be," the secular administration of the affairs of the State. And the introduction of the views of a political thinker tends further to obscure the real question at issue between those who object to State interference with the morals of the commonwealth in a way calculated to corrupt those morals still further, and those who think that the health of the people is of paramount importance, and that it is the duty of the State to enforce a system of sanitary legislation, even when it involves an infringement of personal liberty, trenches on the prerogatives of the Church, and subordinates one class to another in a sense which is subversive of the foundations of morality, and in a manner which is equally opposed not only to the instincts of justice and humanity in its nobler aspect, but also to the rights of the individual citizen.

I would distinguish between the function of the State as the defender of the commonwealth from external danger and internal commotions, and the responsibilities which this function involves towards the organised bodies to whom the country looks for its safety, on the one hand, and on the other its duty not to deprive its citizens of their personal liberty save as a penalty for the violation of their country's laws. If the State administers an Act of Parliament in such a way that the privileges of the citizens are subordinated to the welfare of the army and navy, then the principles of good government seem to me to be grossly violated in any State where military and naval service is optional. And the first step to be taken in such a case is obviously to repeal the Act which inverts the relations of the defensive forces towards the citizens for whose protection those forces exist.

To make a long argument short, every human law is unjust which is not based on the moral law, *i.e.*, in a professedly *Christian* nation, allowing for the exigencies of the commonwealth, and the possibility of invasion and civil war. Martial law may be proclaimed during a campaign or an insurrection, but while the country is at peace, abroad and at home, the interests of civilians must not be sacrificed to the supposed welfare of the troops and sailors.

In the Peninsula campaign, Wellington had the power of life and death, even without a court-martial, over his men; and the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* Act in Ireland gave the Government the power of counteracting the evil effects of the disaffected appeals of insurgent agitators, by depriving them of their liberty.

But I cannot see that such exceptional measures as the Contagious Diseases Acts can be justified on moral, social, or political grounds, unless prostitution had first been constituted an offence against the criminal law. Such legislation, short of the enactment of legal pains and penalties against immorality, seems to me arbitrary and one-sided, inasmuch as it applies to one class only, and that not always the worst, there being more classes than one addicted to sexual vice, and therefore promoters of the social evil.

The distinction I would make, is that while sexual vice may be indulged in with impunity by one sex, save from such physical penalties as it is liable to bring in its train, it is in the other sex treated as a *crime* involving more serious consequences, without the offence having first been rendered criminal, by penal legislation. The bare suspicion of a woman (whose character may yet be respectable) having contracted a bad name through being found in doubtful company or in questionable circumstances, may suffice, and *has sufficed* to subject her to what probably is regarded

* These statistics give the average population, not to each parish, but to each clergyman in charge of a parish, town or country; but of course in towns the disproportion is much larger, the population of town parishes being, in most cases, ten to one; but these averages will show that even in country parishes the work of the Church is not very light, and that unless the number of workers be recruited, the Church cannot overtake the work to be done in thickly-populated districts, and even in rural districts few of the ordained clergy could be spared from their posts. A similar calculation might be entered into respecting the finances of the Church, and would show that were they redistributed on a uniform scale, the average stipend of a clergyman would barely furnish a competence even to a celibate priesthood.

by that woman as a worse evil than that of which she is suspected. And this merely on the plea that it is necessary to secure another citizen—or say subject, whether civilian or otherwise—from the risk of contamination.

If these Acts had provided that only women of bad character found consorting with members of the defensive forces and infecting them, a matter easily ascertained, should be subjected to *necessary* inspection, restraint, and compulsory medical treatment until convalescent, or *reclaimed* (a difficult test to apply) by moral agencies or *friends* (which the thoroughly abandoned would be at a loss to find), I think such legislation would assume a totally different aspect, if not actually unimpugnable. But when State interference extends to women of a certain class indiscriminately, it, at least in a Christian community, infringes the moral law, and this unjustifiably, unless the State consistently makes provision for the application of some system of physical discipline to every offender, irrespective of rank or sex.

I do not think J. S. Mill a good authority in this question, for which I will state my reasons if called on to do so by your correspondent "An Irishwoman."

Nov. 21st, 1881. CUI BONO.

P.S.—I would add that "Rakehells" (an adaptation of the Danish term for "debauchee") should have been disenfranchised under the Contagious Diseases Acts, as some compensation for the evils they inflict on society. They have been the cause of a modification of the British constitution, as it is defined in *Whitaker's Almanack*. "Justice is *impartially* administered, and no one can be punished, except for infringements of the law." The *moral* law is now abrogated by the Contagious Diseases Acts. I confine my argument, however, to *women*, and legislation affecting them, and I say that the Contagious Diseases Acts abrogate that law. Political economy is not the platform "An Irishwoman" should have chosen on which to meet the arguments in favour of polygamy.

SIR,—In seeking to remedy the evils which have lately been discussed in your columns, in order to get at the root of the evil, it is evidently necessary first of all to understand rightly the principles or forces with which we have to deal—their true character and strength. At the bottom of all, we must recognise certain animal instincts and appetites which are planted in the nature of man as well as in all other living creatures.

1. Now, first, what is the character of this instinct? Is it to be reprobated as something essentially bad, mischievous, immoral, unholy? Certainly not: such a judgment as this appears to me nothing less than an insult to the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. It is a most essential part of our constitution; universal, without exception, throughout all animated nature; absolutely indispensable for the continuance of our race. It cannot be bad in itself; but it requires to be exercised within due limits, under proper conditions. Under such conditions, it has always been found a most powerful motive of human action, an element of the highest happiness of which we are capable on earth. When abused, it has been the source of the greatest mischief and misery.

All this is tolerably clear, and will, I suppose, be generally assented to; but when we come to the next point of enquiry, to define these proper limits and conditions, we may find some variance of opinion.

2. The *best* form in which this principle can be developed is that of marriage—single marriage, or monogamy. This state, when the general conditions are suitable, is not only most highly conducive to the health and happiness of the individuals, but is further consecrated, if we may here quote the authority of Scripture, as being a type of that mystical bond which unites Christ to His true Church and people. On the other side, amongst the abuses, we have prostitution, and other crimes even worse than that, bringing with them numberless evils of various kinds, and of intense severity. I will not attempt to paint them here: much has already been written on the subject; and very much more might be written. How is it, then, we may ask—if there is this immense difference between the lawful and the unlawful exercise of this instinct—how is it that so many, both men and women, choose the bad instead of the good? Why does not every man, as St. Paul advises, have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, in the most proper and lawful form of marriage? Much, of course, must be put down to that general perversity and spirit of disobedience which wilfully chooses evil rather than good, and will not be bound by any laws; much also to various subsidiary causes which I will not stop to dwell upon here. But these things will not account for everything. The fact is that marriage, in the only form in which it legally exists in this country, is not a simple matter, but is complicated with various social laws and exigencies which constitute great impediments to its free and natural course. First, there is the important matter of expense. The difficulty with many a man is not so much that he cannot keep a family, but that he cannot keep them in the style which society—that is, his own social circle—requires. Then again, the husband and wife must stand on almost exactly the same level in the social scale: whatever other personal qualities may exist to make them suitable to each other, any considerable social disparity is almost sure to make things unpleasant, and therefore frightens away the man from the alliance. And lastly, to be brief, our law insists rigidly upon the state of monogamy. One man and one woman must be bound together for life; and in spite of any discrepancies of character, age, or physical powers which may arise between them, there is no help for it, no release from the bond, no other union possible. This is the general principle which our law asserts, subject of late years indeed to some few exceptions.

And such considerations as these lead many men, who are not altogether of that lawless type above mentioned, to pause before they enter upon such a serious bondage; to pause again and again; and in many cases, perhaps, where there is not some strong controlling spiritual power within them, to fall more or less deeply into the vortex of illicit intercourse.

3. Here then it becomes important to ask, is there no other legitimate course open, between these highest and most rigorous conditions of marriage on the one hand, and those debasing crimes on the other; no other form under which those natural instincts may lawfully be exercised? Our preachers and moralists generally will say, No; none whatever: any sensual indulgence of this kind, outside the strict bond of marriage, is absolutely sinful, and ought to be absolutely and entirely suppressed. As a matter of fact, however, there are two important variations or deviations from these strict laws, which are both well-known in the history of mankind, and both of them very frequently mentioned in our sacred history. These are Polygamy and Concubinage; the former allowing a man to take to himself more than one woman to wife; the latter implying a union on somewhat different terms from those of strict marriage; and practically

allowing a man to take a partner who may be not his equal in social rank, without at the same time sacrificing his own position. Both of these conditions, I say, are frequently mentioned in Scripture: and how are they mentioned? Are they tolerated as lawful, or are they condemned as sinful? As you have done me the favour of noticing at some length my little Work, "Hagar," which treats of these matters, I may venture here to refer to your extracts in last week's PULPIT, and to the book itself, as showing that both of these practices were positively allowed in the Old Testament; and are at least not expressly condemned in the New; and further, that the state of concubinage, as a lower form of marriage, was well-known in the early days of the Christian Church, and was distinctly allowed by some of the early Canons, provided it was not polygamous. These are at least important historical facts; facts of Scripture, and facts of Christian history. And these two conditions, especially the latter, concubinage, in a recognised form, and under certain limitations, will be found, I think, to meet the requirement which evidently exists; to supply a legitimate middle course between the two extremes to which most men are now driven.

I cannot, however, attempt to enter upon this practical part of my subject in the present letter. It is a wide subject, in which no doubt much may be said on both sides. For the present, I can only hope that I have at least done something in the way of laying a foundation for further discussion; first, in showing that we have powerful instincts to deal with, which are not to be despised or ignored; and further, that there is at least so much to be said in defence of the two practices just named, on the ground of Scriptural authority, that we certainly need not be afraid to take them into our consideration, in spite of any modern prejudices against them.

Nov. 23rd, 1881. M. D.

SIR,—Many of your readers must be curious to know what is meant by "a well-regulated polygamy," an expression which has occurred several times in your columns.

Persons accustomed all their lives to Christian ethics, and to a practice based on New Testament principles, find it impossible to form any conception of such a thing as "a well-regulated polygamy."

Many of us have been much shocked in recent years by attempts on the part of the State to regulate sexual vice, and are inclined, I believe, to accept the view that the attempt to regulate polygamy, for whatever purpose, a practice which 999·9 out of every 1,000 instructed Christians hold to be un-Christian, would be like that other, an unholy undertaking, and an equally miserable failure.

Perhaps I may be permitted to say also that not a few of your readers would protest against your definition of adultery (as given on page 231, Nov. 5th, 1881). You seem to confine that term to what may be described as a sort of material confusion and mingling, ignoring altogether as non-existent the moral adultery in which there may be nothing of that sort; but perhaps your language is misunderstood.

Some of the arguments of "Clk." in defence of, I presume, "a well-regulated polygamy," are, to say the least, startling, unless we are to suppose that they are nothing more than irony—*e.g.*, he says that "if the State may tamper with the marriage laws by forbidding some to marry, she may equally relax it in the opposite direction, and allow a plurality of wives. Further, if the State robs thousands of girls of the chance of the monogamic bond, it ought to leave them free to accept if they will the condition of polygamy."

It is extremely doubtful whether the State has the right to place restrictions on matrimony in the case of soldiers, &c., but leaving that doubt on one side, "Clk's." argument, always supposing it not to be ironical, is absolutely untenable; the right to restrict liberty in one direction by no means involves the right to sanction licence in another—to put a simple case, I may forbid my servants to go out at night after a certain hour, but that does not mean that I may give leave to other persons to stay out all night if they please. And if to restrict the marriage of certain classes be to inflict a wrong on thousands of marriageable girls, that wrong cannot be righted by sanctioning polygamy, another wrong.

Again, to adduce cases in which monogamy seems to work badly, because individual men will not be chaste, as a reason for sanctioning polygamy—is to adduce an argument which will not hold water. We might break down every restriction in favour of honesty, truth, virtue, purity, &c., if the inconvenience of being pure, virtuous, truthful, honest, were to be deemed a sufficient reason for doing so.

These and other arguments are not worth the paper they are printed on. You must first of all persuade the religious sentiment of the nineteenth century that polygamy is not un-Christian before you will gain a moment's attention to such arguments, and I venture to say that neither "Clk." nor any other writer will succeed in doing that.

The case as regards polygamy stands pretty much on the same ground as that in regard to slavery—neither are denounced in set terms, but both are implicitly condemned by the whole tenour of the teaching of our Lord and of His Apostles. You may see this principle asserted in reference to slavery in Dr. Macdonald's sermon in your own pages. (See page 217, Nov. 5th, 1881). L. S. C.

[By a well-regulated polygamy we meant one in which the rights of the wives were properly and legally secured; for details our correspondent may consult the Pentateuch and Koran. We were asked to define adultery as a cause of divorce, and consequently were necessitated to confine it to *physical* acts and their consequences. We must not be supposed thereby to ignore the great sin of moral and spiritual adultery. If "L. S. C." can demonstrate that polygamy violates the law of God as laid down in the Old or New Testament, it must not be entertained for one moment, even if it be a perfect preventive of prostitution, adultery, and fornication. We do not see that polygamy, like slavery, is implicitly condemned by the whole tenour of the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles. We read Dr. Macdonnell's sermon with very great satisfaction, and should be pleased if he or our correspondent would apply the same conclusive reasoning to polygamy as he has done to slavery. We think our correspondent, like many others, is wrong in assuming that there are different moral laws enjoined in the New to those in the Old Testament.—ED.]

SIR,—I wish that your correspondents had all kept to the question, viz., whether these Acts should be extended or repealed, amended or maintained. You showed in your first leader on the subject that it was not fair to call these Acts, passed for the prevention of a very prevalent and most loathsome disease, affecting innocent as well as guilty persons, Acts for the State regulation of vice. I have done my utmost to show your readers why these Acts ought to be extended.

Let me recapitulate my reasons.

1. Because they have reduced disease to a most considerable extent in the places where they are enforced. This has been proved so clearly that though passed now in some places twelve and in others fifteen years ago, the unanimous opinions of the officers of the army and navy, both medical and combatant, is that they ought to be extended to all naval and military stations. Miss Bewicke's description of the meeting at the International Medical Congress is as erroneous as her account of the Chatham Lock Hospital, and the "cell," which exists only in her imagination. These diseases are propagated by contagion, the *fons et origo mali* being common prostitutes. By removing these latter when diseased you remove the source of contagion, and therefore diminish disease. To assert that these Acts do not diminish but increase disease, is to insult common sense. Had this been so the officers of the army and navy, the medical and combatant, would have demanded either their amendment or repeal.

2. Because they have in the few years of their existence done more to prevent prostitution and reclaim fallen women than all the refuges, homes, rescue societies, and kindred agencies, which have ever existed. Your correspondent, "An Inhabitant of Chatham," in Saturday's issue, has ably shown how the special police work, and how false it is to compare these Acts with the Continental system. Hundreds of girls enter the ranks of prostitution every year in towns and cities where these Acts are not enforced, who might be saved if they were. Impelled by pique, curiosity, vanity, or other cause, they follow their fallen sisters into dens of infamy in utter ignorance of what they are doing. It is then that the interference of an intelligent police officer is so valuable, and I maintain that no brothel should be allowed to exist except under the most frequent and rigid police inspection. This would reduce them by two-thirds or three-fourths, as has been proved in many cases. But the Acts do more ; when women have fallen and persist in continuing a life of prostitution, they are not left to pursue that life unheeded and uncared for. Every fortnight they are taken from it, and while care is taken that they are not spreading disease, they are reminded by the surgeons and police that whenever they wish to abandon their horrible life the way is open to them to do so. In hospital they have the kind sympathies of the matrons or lady superintendents as well as the chaplains. The former are selected not so much for their experience of hospitals as of female refuges, or Homes for Fallen Women. If any patients wish to abandon their calling, and to return to their friends, their expenses are paid ; if they wish to enter a home or go to service, every assistance is afforded. Will "An Irishwoman" tell us what was done for the "Curragh Wrens" until these Acts were applied to the Camp there? Would she or Miss Bewicke have taken the place of the matron of the Kildare Hospital, who nobly stuck to her post and her hard work after some of these wild creatures had torn the hair out of her head? Will she also tell us what was done at Cork and Queenstown until the Acts were applied there, and the Government provided a Lock hospital with nearly fifty beds. Then and then only were these poor creatures cared for and ample means for their reformation adopted.

But it will be said many of these women return to prostitution. So they do, but in spite of the Acts, not in consequence of them. I cannot concur in the view some take that prostitution in rags and filth is a less demoralising spectacle than prostitution decently attired and clean. All good in this world is done by human means. The mind and soul must be approached through the body. To attempt the reform of a prostitute while she is living in a brothel with all the surroundings would be simply a mockery. But to take her away from it, to cure her body, to teach her habits of self-respect and cleanliness is at least an approach to reform. One great error made by many of your correspondents is that of generalising too much. There are prostitutes and prostitutes. Some are thoroughly hardened, and will return to their calling do what you will. Others again are weary of it, and only want such an opportunity as these Acts afford, but no other system, to lead a new and virtuous life. A third class are halting between two opinions, and in them may be many a relapse before reform takes place. The Acts meet all these cases ; any so-called voluntary system fails, except in a very few instances.

3. So far from these Acts encouraging vice in any way, my conviction is that they act entirely in the opposite direction. You cannot reduce the number of prostitutes and prevent that number from being recruited, without at the same time removing much temptation from the streets ; and, moreover, young men are chary of visiting brothels which they know are under constant police supervision. This is why the inhabitants of those places where the Acts are in force loyally support them, and *will not have them repealed*, knowing well what a flood of vice and immorality would soon follow. Meetings held for the repeal of these Acts in such places have little or no support, and their Parliamentary representatives know better than to vote for their repeal. The question is not a political one, Liberals and Conservatives being both on the side of opponents and supporters, though the former are still, as formerly, in a most decided minority. In four of the five debates which have taken place in the House of Commons since 1870, the motion of repeal has been defeated by a majority of two to one, and in the remaining case it was talked out. And each succeeding year strengthens the cause of the Acts and weakens that of their opponents.

If my suggestion (published by you some time ago), that supporters and opponents should try to discover points of agreement rather than points of difference, some good might have been done. But the opponents will not listen to reason, nor give the Acts the slightest credit. Repeal and nothing else will satisfy them.

I have shown your readers why I support these Acts, and I have reasons to think that I express the views of many others. If the clergy really wish to mitigate the "social evil," they will heartily and loyally support these Acts. They need not fear that their efforts in the cause of morality will be in the least degree impeded ; on the contrary, they will find their hands considerably strengthened. They can also on their part strengthen the hands of those who are really working out the reclamation of fallen women, not merely talking, nor writing impractical epistles. The chaplains, medical officers, and matrons of the Government Lock Hospitals do not neglect nor ill-use these women ; nor do they encourage them in their vicious life. They minister to their bodies and minds, and every woman, as she leaves, is free as the air she breathes to go where she pleases. Surely we may say of such a system that it is at least a humble imitation of what was said by Him who is our Highest Example to the woman taken in adultery, in the very act, "Go in peace, and sin no more."

28th Nov., 1881. A SURGEON.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHURCH BELLS.

By the Ven. MAURICE T. de BURGH, M.A.,
Archdeacon of Kildare and Rector of Naas.

Sermon Preached at the Dedication of the Peal of Bells in St. Bartholomew's Church, Dublin, on October 6th, 1881.

"My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord."—Ps. cxlv. 21.

I HAVE chosen this sentence of the Divine Word as one suited to this present service for a reason personal to myself. In the old church in which I have been permitted—by the good mercy of God—to minister for two-and-twenty years, there is a bell, cast more than two hundred years ago, which has inscribed upon it this text, "Os meum laudabit Dominum"—"My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord." It was not merely a quaint fancy which led our forefathers to inscribe upon our church bells such sentences as these. It was the natural and pious recognition of a great truth, viz., that all things, which have any charm or service in the material world, derive their charm and utility from the Giver of every good and perfect gift. The marble in the quarry, the gold in the mine, the pearl in the shell, the gem hidden in the recesses of the rock—all derive their beauty and their value from Him. So it is also with the mysterious pleasure that all sweet music gives to man. It is the mind of God that devised, it is the hand of God that adjusted the delicate vibrations which captivate the ear, and the exquisite harmonies which charm the sense. His, too, the gift that has enabled some, and those not many, of the sons of men to draw forth new treasures from the store of harmony with which our world is encircled, and inspired them to compose those strains which traverse the whole range of the soul's emotions, evoking alike the brightest joy and the bitterest sorrow, expressing alike the shout of those that triumph, and the wail of those that weep. All music owes its power and its sweetness to Him in Whose Presence the heavenly harpers are ever "harping with their harps." And no music demands a more definite consecration to Him than that which an eminent writer has termed "the best music of a country, the music of her church-bells." "A music," he adds, "hallowed by all circumstances . . . . which, according equally with social exultation, and with solitary pensiveness, though it falls upon many an unheeding ear, never fails to find some hearts which it exhilarates, and some which it softens." (Southey. "Bk. of the Church," p. 306.)

Manifold are the voices with which church bells speak, and have for centuries spoken, to listening ears. They are the exponents of national joy and sorrow. They are the monitors of the Church, announcing her sacred seasons, and summoning her children to services of prayer and praise. And they have also a voice for each individual heart of those who live within their range, for they have a sympathetic power to stir the emotions of the soul, to waken up old memories, to speak of home, childhood, friends, happiness, to draw the tears that

> Rise in the heart, and gather to the eyes,
> In thinking of the days that are no more.

Each one of these voices may suggest to us some solemn reflections, and mould our prayers and aspirations on an occasion like the present.

1. When we think of these bells as expressing, in years to come, national joy or sorrow, we may remember how, in former days, the church bells of a city were often used to summon the citizens together, to repel invasion, or repress internal tumult, or—as is still the case in many a foreign town—to sound the alarm of fire. And we may pray that the sweet bells, which we this day dedicate, may never "give any warning note of conflagration, of pestilence, of tumult, or any other peril." (Haweis.)

Then we may go back, in thought, to the sad event which, but a few days ago, awoke such intense and universal sympathy all over the civilized world, and recall that memorable and unequalled day of mourning, when the muffled peals sent forth their notes of sorrow in every city of America, and from many an English belfry. And we may pray that *these* iron tongues may seldom proclaim our country's sorrow or calamity, but that often they may respond to her rejoicing, and bear their witness that God is gracious to our land, and fulfils our constant prayer: "Grant, O Lord, we beseech Thee, that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by Thy governance, that Thy Church may joyfully serve Thee in all godly quietness."

2. And when, in the prayers now to be offered, you ask of God that these bells may serve as effective monitors of the Church, that when they summon the faithful to meet together for worship, the call may meet a joyful response on the part of many who shall "love the habitation of God's house, and the place where His honour dwelleth;" remember that, indirectly, you are asking for great things, even that the continual dew of God's blessing may rest upon this church and parish, and that the abiding influence of His Holy Spirit may be vouchsafed to those who shall here minister before the Lord. That "blessed unction from

above" is our only safeguard from all coldness, declension, unbelief, and irreligion; to it we owe all that renders worship really attractive and beneficial, "all comfort, life, and fire of love." You, who frequent this fair and beautiful church, and share in her services, so carefully, so reverently, and so heartily performed, have great reason to pray that, during the years to come, the good work now maintained may prosper, and that the powers of the world to come may here be brought home to many a soul, moving it to confess, "Surely the Lord is in this place . . . this is none other than the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

3. But I would say a special word to you to-day on that other voice with which these bells will speak to you—a voice which will form their peculiar charm, which lies in the sweet and solemn music with which they will record the flight of each passing hour. I mean the voice which will appeal to each individual heart of those who hear them day by day, gently and constantly calling to them to "redeem the time," to consecrate their daily life and the routine of ordinary duty to God Most High.

There is no lesson which we have greater need to lay to heart. Alas! my brethren, that it should be so difficult to learn! difficult because our own wilful, selfish, and contracted way of viewing things makes the gap between things truly Divine and truly human so wide. Christ our Lord has set most of us to serve Him in the sphere of ordinary life. Some, indeed, He summons to great and arduous effort, to brave conflict, to heroic endurance, yea, to keen suffering. But these are, comparatively speaking, the few: for the many His will is that

> The trivial round, the common task,
> Should furnish all they ought to ask:
> Room to deny themselves; a road
> To bring them, daily, nearer God.

It has been truly said—

> Where holy ground begins and common ends
> Is marked by no distinguishable line;

and our constant aim should be to maintain "a free communion between the sacred and the social sides of life," and lift all duties upon earth to the higher level of the Christian standard.

In no case is this boundary line so faint; in no instance does the social life so nearly touch the sacred, as when men lay themselves out to promote the comfort and happiness of their fellows, when they devote themselves to the anxious consideration of such questions as those, which, during the present week, have, in this city, occupied public attention.* To mitigate the hardships of the poor, to check the spreading of disease, to repress the growth of crime, to repel the seductions of vice, to plead the cause of the orphan, the destitute, and the helpless—in a word to lighten the burden of suffering which lies upon our race, and do battle against the power of evil in our midst. Surely, brethren, these are aims which, if not distinctly religious, yet border closely on religion—yea to be transformed into distinctly religious acts they need but one thing—to be consecrated by faith and prayer. And sure I am that there were leaders in this Congress, who, while they took part in its deliberations, did so consecrate their efforts in their inmost heart, and thought not only of humanity, but of that great Redeemer and Consoler, whose love for the whole human race "passeth knowledge," Who Himself "took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses, Whose teaching, sympathy, and example first woke up the world to a sense of the sacred obligations of philanthropy.

Be this, then, our earnest prayer to-day that God may bless and consecrate our daily life; in the words of old George Herbert—

> Teach me, my God and King
> In all things Thee to see;
> And what I do in anything
> To do it as for Thee.

And then he sets forth as the elixir of life, the charmed tincture which can transmute the baser metals of earth into the gold of Heaven, as gathered up into these three words, "For Thy Sake."

As these chimes which you will hear to-day for the first time become to you as familiar friends, let the burden of their music, as it sounds from the house of God, ever be, "Brethren, let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God." "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.

It will not be so very long before we shall pass away to a world where such monitors as these shall be no longer needed. Yea we know not when these and all other church bells shall be silent; for of the day and the hour that the Church's work shall end, and her mission be accomplished "knoweth no man, no, not the angels in Heaven." On one of the great bells in Strasburgh Cathedral, more than five hundred years old, there is this inscription "*O Rex Gloriæ, Christe, Veni in pace*," "O Christ, the King of Glory, come in peace." Beautiful conception! to make the iron tongues of time plead for the hour when time shall be no more, and re-echo the Church's prayer "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." Oh that we may so use the hours of time that we may stand in our lot in that eternal kingdom of which it is written "I saw no temple there for the Lord God is the temple of it, and the Lamb is the Light thereof."

* The Social Science Congress was holding its meetings in Dublin at the time that this sermon was preached.

SECULARISM.

By the Rev. JOSEPH FOXLEY, M.A., Vicar of Market Weighton, York, Hulsean Lecturer, and late Fellow of St. John's College.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, Nov. 27th, 1881.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth."—Rev. xxi. 1.

THE revelation of St John is commended to the study of Christian people by a special promise. They are warned against neglecting or misusing it by a special threat. And of all the books in the world this is the only book that claims, as a book, to come to Christians with such special and urgent demands upon their attention. The promise stands at the beginning; the threat close to the end. What, then, is the main drift and purpose of a book thus beginning, thus ending?

We may often get a good glimpse of a writer's meaning by reading a few pages toward the end of his work. In the Revelation, the last chapter but one, and the first sixteen verses of the last chapter, form a section by themselves; though, from their use of peculiar terms scattered up and down the whole book, they must by no means be regarded as a mere appendix. What do they say, and what do they mean? First we read of a new heaven and a new earth; and the new earth differs from the old earth, first of all in having no sea. An earth without a sea differs so strangely from the earth that now is, that our imagination fails us in any attempt to picture it. Then a holy city, a new Jerusalem comes down from heaven. St. Paul said that the citizenship of Christians was in heaven. But how was the city of the Christian citizenship to come down out of heaven to stand upon the earth? In the third verse we find that, as one particular of this coming down of the holy city, the tabernacle of God was with men. Emmanuel, God with us, meets us in the very first chapter of St. Matthew. But what is this divine presence to do? God, so dwelling with men, shall wipe away every tear from their eyes. There is to be no more mourning, nor crying, nor pain. Even death will have no place in the new earth. The first things are passed away. All things are to be made new, yet among those first things we find no mention of the grass and the herb yielding seed, nor of the moving creature that hath life. The things that are mentioned are not among the things of which it is said that God made them in the beginning, and saw that they were good. Putting an end to these things would be a renewal indeed. But why is there no more sea? Later on we read that the city had no need of sun or moon. Yet sun, and moon, and sea, were all good.

We have now considered some of the particulars of the prophecy. Is there any clue to the time when it was to be fulfilled? If we can fix the time, we can, perhaps, fix the meaning. In the tenth verse of the 22nd chapter we read, "the time is at hand." "Seal not up the words of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand." *When* was it at hand? In the beginning of the book the writer declares himself to be one "John, who bare witness of the Word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, even of all things that he saw; that he was a servant of Jesus Christ, and was in the Isle that is called Patmos, for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus." But it is needless to argue that the Revelation was written by John the Apostle. Whatever else modern criticism may have disturbed, it has settled that. So then, some eighteen hundred years have passed since the time was at hand. Why then do we not see the new heaven and the new earth? Has God made all things new, or was the Apostle mistaken? Death is not passed away. Mourning, crying, and pain are still upon the earth. All things are old, and not new. Tears still come; and often there is no kindly hand to wipe them away. But let us think. This congregation consists, partly of those who, as yet, are rejoicing in their youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh when thou shall say I have no pleasure in them. Yet even among them there may be some who have stood and knelt, though it have been but once, by the bedside of one for whom in all appearance the time of dissolution was drawing near. At such a time has not the brief bright Gospel for the Communion of the Sick flashed into their hearts, if but for a moment, the secret of our text? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life." "Passed out of death into life"! Christians have been used to believe that these words were recorded by the same Apostle as he who wrote of the new earth in which there was no more death.

And St. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, the fifth chapter, writes: "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things [are] passed away; behold they are become new." But, says the great prophet of the Old Testament, "the wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace saith my God for the wicked." The new creation is within. The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. "Ye must be born anew." No change may happen to sun or moon, or natural ocean. Rains and winds may keep their courses. The body may sicken; business may fail; friends may prove false; the love of many for the Friend of all may wax cold; yet, with a heart believing in God's righteousness, and firmly grounded upon the Eternal Word, all will be new. Not all at once; but enough, even from the moment that we ask the way to Zion,

with our faces thitherward, enough to cheer us onward and upward; changing us from glory into glory, while with unveiled face we reflect as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, and are led by His Spirit. They that overcome the evil overcome the sorrow. For them—gentle souls they are, most of them, unknown to the great ones of the earth, but dear to the Almighty—for them, in the midst of life's trial, there is always peace. For them dying is not death, but the gate of life. For them there is safe passage over the troublesome waves. They know nothing of storms, when they hear the Voice that says, "It is I, be not afraid." They walk with their Lord; the waters are firm beneath their feet, no more sea casting up mire and dirt, but that sea which rests and shines before the Throne. *They* walk with their Lord; *they* walk in the light; *they* have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus cleanseth them from all sin. The sea is no more, nor the night. The great vision of the Revelation is no mere dream, of a world yet to come, in which everybody is to be made happy by a change of circumstances. It is an ideal which may become real in this world, here and now, to all who are willing to have it realised. The unwilling are "*without*," with every one that loveth and maketh a lie. For them there is no Immanuel, God with us; for them the tears are not wiped away; for them death reigns as heretofore, and death's forerunners and followers, mourning, and crying and pain; whole seas of trouble.

Yet there is hope even for them. Though there is no sea in the new earth, there is a river; the river of Eden parted into four heads for all lands; the river of Ezekiel, proceeding from the sanctuary, a river of water of life. On this side of the river and on that is the tree of life, bearing twelve manner of fruits, yielding its fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations. What nations? Nations in heaven? Nations in Paradise? Nations in hell? or nations yet to be born? Nay, my brothers, but the nations that now are, and that have been, nations that surely have needed healing, and need it; nations who should walk amidst the light of the holy city, and whose kings should bring their glory into it. Not the nations of the saved. St. John did not so write. The Spirit did not so speak to the Churches. That is the wrong translation of a bad gloss. To set this one verse right would have been worth all the labour of the new Revision. Man's blindness and unbelief have thrust God's promise for the present into a vague and shadowy future, and thereby many have missed the present healing of the tree of life, and died before they discerned the holy city.

But the vision of the New Jerusalem is placed after the vision of the Great White Throne, and the final judgment. Yes. But the conclusion which at first sight seems so obvious, on further consideration becomes impossible. Besides the various reasons which have been given already, here is one which cannot be reasoned against. We read of "the Camp of the Saints and the holy city" in the twentieth chapter, as being on the earth before the judgment. In the higher order of thought, the city is after the judgment; or rather, its true citizens have no terrors of judgment to look forward to. They may stand before the judgment seat, but they "come not into judgment." They have "passed out of death into life." But that is a mystery of the eternal life, a life which, whatever else we may have to learn of it, we know is not measured by seasons, and days, and years. The life that is so measured has need of the sun and moon to lighten it.

Perhaps the key to the Revelation, and to Genesis also, may be found in other words of the Lord Jesus, recorded by St. John, "My Father worketh even until now, and I work." Does not God call the light out of darkness every morning? Is He not always dividing the waters, causing the earth to bring forth grass, and herb and tree, making the greater and lesser lights, filling water, air, and land with living creatures; creating man in his own likeness, and giving him charge to subdue the earth? What if the mystic week, so brief, so continually recurring, declare in its seven-fold perfection that God worketh even until now? Thus without denying any other legitimate meaning, or meanings; for words are living creatures, full of meanings, looking before and after. We may venture to say that while the most part of the Bible is occupied by phenomena, the beginning and the end seem to reveal the underlying principles. Their symbolism is marvellously alike, so much so that the whole course of scripture seems to revolve itself into a circle, the two ends meeting as in the Egyptian symbol of eternity, not a straight line lost either way in the darkness. Only between the two so blended ends, the flaming sword has been bathed in blood, and thereby changed into gates of pearl.

"Behold, now is the accepted time, behold now is the day of salvation." What if now also is the day of judgment? Daniel's four beasts, the signs of brute empires, were never seen by mortal eye rising out of the sea. Why should we stand looking into the sky for the sign of the Son of Man, or listen with our ears for a literal trumpet? As I said just now, I do not deny such a visible coming, such an audible sounding. God forbid that I should in any wise take away from the words of the phophecy of this book. But I plead for a practical recognition of the coming that now is, of the trumpet that now calls to us, according to the interpretation which I am thankful to have learnt many years ago from the writings of Mr. Maurice. Said not our Lord to the High Priest and the Council, Henceforth, from this time forward, ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand

of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven? And this "Henceforth" He spake only three days after He had spoken of the Son of Man coming in His glory, and all the nations being gathered before Him for eternal punishment or eternal life. We have been accustomed to read for henceforth, hereafter, and to read the hereafter wrong. The revisers have here again done excellent service by striking out the ambiguous word; its very ambiguity having possibly arisen from men's reading into it, in this very passage, the false imagination which has well-nigh robbed us Bible-loving English of the Bible's last prophecy. Anything to get rid of hearing the Lord's voice to-day, any time but now.

"Ye are come unto Mount Zion." The New Jerusalem is a present possession. I have said indeed that the change that makes all things new to the Christian, and makes the New Jerusalem his present possession, is a change within. But it is a change that must work from within outwards. It is not to be kept, as the wicked servant kept his talent, wrapt up and without increase. The Christian must be prepared, according to his opportunities, to face all the great questions of the age, and to raise some questions which the age would willingly let sleep. Crime and vice are not merely to be mourned over. Questions of pauperism; of capital and wages; of public amusements; of commercial honesty; of methods of healing diseases, and preventing them; the question of education, and many like matters, are to be thought of, prayed over, and taken in hand because the Lord has put them in our way. Above all, we must promote the Kingdom of God by the brightness of a good example in little matters which come every day. A chastened temper, a tongue that speaks no evil, cheerfulness amidst petty worries, purity of heart ever eloquent in its silence, thoughtfulness for others rather than for ourselves, these are the qualities of those precious stones that build up the walls of the holy city. These are the ways in which we may fulfil the sane aspiration of a half-insane poet:

> I will not cease from mental fight,
> Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
> Till we have built Jerusalem
> In England's green and pleasant land.

I have been much interested by a bold attempt which has been made during the last year or two, to meet the working men of East London, ninety-five per cent. of whom are said to attend no place of worship. The promoters have associated themselves together in a little society, under the name of the Guild of St. Matthew. There are one or two things in the rules of the Guild that appear to me to be unwise; but the purpose of the movement, "to justify God to the people," is one that deserves the widest sympathy. The means have been chiefly popular lectures, followed by open discussions. Invitations have been issued to men and women of every religion or of no religion, and the discussions have been as full and free as possible. These discussions seem to have made it quite clear that the secularism which has laid such hold upon many among the masses, is directed almost exclusively against erroneous doctrines about Christianity, rather than against the Catholic Faith. The doctrines from which these men have recoiled in horror and disgust are such doctrines as the predestination to damnation of an overwhelming majority of the human race; of salvation from punishment by schemes that have often satisfied learned divines, but which crumble to pieces under the plain common sense of those who must labour or starve. Then, as to the inspiration of the Bible, it appears that most of those who attend the lectures or most of those who express their opinions, hold the Christian doctrine to be this—

(1) That inspiration is exclusively confined to the books contained in the Canon.

(2) That the inspiration of the Bible is verbal and literal, an infallible dictation by Almighty God.

Many would seem to add—(3) That all this applies to the English Version of the Bible as much as to the original.

My informant says, truly enough, that it would be easy to reason out the results of such theories. But he gives me the following as plainly observed facts:—

First, a total ignorance of the teaching of St. John about our Lord as the Word of God, and a practical substitution of a book for a person.

Secondly, when the intelligent but ill-instructed Bible-Christian comes in contact with the moral teaching of the ancient religions, and learns that Confucius or Buddha, the Greek Philosophers, or the old Egyptian religion, inculcated a morality in many points the same as that of the Bible, he is apt to run to the conclusion that the Bible is of no special value.

Once more, it is plain that these men have no belief in a spiritual society, or in the possibility of every man having the thoughts of his heart cleansed by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Consequently a single contradiction or apparent contradiction in any part of the scriptures is held to disprove the divine authority of the whole. The same result is held to follow from the different methods employed in scripture and by modern science to describe the invisible universe. There is also a wide-spread belief that Abraham, David, and others, are held up in the Bible as perfect examples.

And lastly. Hardly a single unbeliever whom the promoters of this movement have come across, seems ever to have heard of the elementary fact that the kingdom of heaven of the Gospel is primarily a righteous society upon earth. Where, indeed, should they have learnt it? The Thirty-nine Articles pass it by. Our beautiful collects expect it in the glory of a future dispensation, and

rightly so, but they do not look for it very distinctly in this; while, by excluding from her calendar for centuries, the only book of scripture which scripture directs to be read, the Church of England acted as if the words that St. John was commanded not to seal, were sealed, nevertheless. After seventy years of religious education it seems to me that we have almost to begin again. Have not a large proportion of secularists, in London and elsewhere, gone through the day schools of the Church? Was not their very leader a teacher in a Church Sunday School. What is to be done? Perhaps nothing will be done as it ought to be until some one in authority has the courage to touch the very centre of the system, and to have it plainly laid down in the Prayer-book, that the Bible is not what these men have, very naturally, supposed we think it to be; and that the kingdom of God, of which they are taught in the catechism, they have been made inheritors, is a kingdom in which they have a share even now, though it reaches onward from this world into a better. Meantime, "to justify God to the people," by proclaiming the Gospel of the Kingdom, as John the Baptist and Christ proclaimed it, seems to me to be a kind of mission at least as necessary as the more emotional proceedings which of late years have usually been associated with that term; more likely to tell upon men who live on the shady side of this world than the usual appeals about dangers in another; more likely to put thinking men in the way of escaping those dangers.

Nor is the process one which should be confined to that terrible ninety-five per cent. Take up a book which, in less than nine years, has run through more than as many editions, a book by one whose breadth and acuteness I regard with, I hope, a pardonable envy—The Study of Sociology. In it I read the following as part of what the writer finds in the Athanasian Creed, "that one of the Almighties suffered on the Cross, and decended into Hell to pacify another of them." The passage occurs in a chapter on the Theological Bias, and it is a remarkable instance of that bias. Had the writer weighed the meaning of some other words that he quotes, "There are not three Almighties, but one Almighty," he might have found that one principal use of the creed is to shut out as, incredible and impossible, the "pacifying" which he has read into it. God so loved the world, not hated it, that he found a way to save it. Still this creed, clear and scientific as far as it goes, and involving no more difficult conceptions than physical science has to encounter every day in all human conceptions of space and time, is silent on the Gospel of the Kingdom. We need not blame the critic very much for his mistake. The blame belongs in some sort to us all, and to our forefathers, for turning the good news of the kingdom of righteousness upon earth into a tale of horrors beyond the grave. The very judgment which we have sought to evade by our feelings and our ceremonies is expressly declared by the Judge Himself to turn upon quite other considerations, whether we have, or have not, been doing the duty of citizens of the New Jerusalem; wiping away tears, putting away death, and moaning, and crying, and pain; feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, housing the homeless, clothing the naked, visiting the sick and the prisoner; following Christ's example, that is taking Christ's principles, the principles which he applied, under the limitations of His Incarnation, to the simple society of Palestine, and applying them by the abundant means revealed to men by His Spirit in our age, to the more intricate problems of modern Christendom. Much has, indeed, been done with these problems though sometimes rather as duties annexed to religion, than as essential parts of it. When we look back to the beginning of the Gospel, we can see that whether men have consciously believed in the kingdom or not, and some in all generations probably have, the achievements of the kingdom have been very great. But there must be something wrong in the way the Kingdom of God is commonly presented to men, when the president of the British Association could say at York that "To science we owe the idea of progress." When our Saviour stood up in the synagogue at Nazareth, and read "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He anointed Me to preach good tidings to the poor; He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord," He must have had some idea of progress. Was there no thought of progress in these other words?—"Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for My sake and the Gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life."

When Christianity was young it really did all this. Those who made the great venture found themselves members of a warm-hearted and powerful society, brothers in a world-wide family, aye, in a family that reached beyond the world into the many mansions of the Father. If Christ's great conception has shrivelled up since then into a narrow Phariseeism, very like that which he denounced; or if our nominally Christian civilization bears a strong resemblance here and there to the Babylon of both Testaments, be it the resolve of our generation to begin Christ's work anew.

First in ourselves, as individuals. Sin is a fact; it must be destroyed. But it cannot be destroyed by words, so long as those words stand fast which God spake in the beginning, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." But it is quite intelligible that the Eternal Word, taking up

our manhood into His Godhead, passing through the grave to the life beyond, and thereby making all things new for His own humanity, has possessed Himself with some strange but most real contagion of atonement, so that every sinful soul that does not wilfully refuse His touch, is changed back into His pure image and likeness. And this He has done, not without cost, as a child scatters upon the floor the beads it has strung together, but with pain unutterable, humiliation inconceivable,—wrestling, as it were, with His own unchangeable laws, and, without changing them, working out of them salvation for us who broke them. Yes, if we would conquer, it must be through the Cross. Progress and brotherhood come from Him by whom all things were made, who is also our Brother. Brotherhood without a Father is a rope of sand. To oppose to passion an abstraction, or anything less than a stronger passion, is certain failure. But when through the blood of the everlasting covenant, a man has entered in through the gates into the city, let him ask God to send him another whom he may teach and lead through the same joyous portals, and then, with some kindred souls, let him single out for them and for himself some task for God.

For instance, and it is but one instance out of many, there is the abolition of war. Chimerical—Yes; and so was the abolition of slavery. When Christ came, slavery was greater than war. War was sometimes in some places. Slavery was always everywhere. Its abolition was so chimerical that neither Christ nor His Apostles said one word about it. Yet they accomplished it. These words at Nazareth about good tidings, release, and liberty, were the trumpet-call to the great year of Jubilee. Gradually, very gradually, the release has come. Perhaps it is not easy to say exactly when the English labourer became a free man. Still, all over Christendom, white slavery has ceased to be recognised by law. So has black. This, too, took a long time; not so long as the other, but it was a thing of more concentrated effort. A letter to a newspaper by a Yorkshire schoolboy; a prize essay by a Cambridge Bachelor; these were small beginnings. But that boy was Wilberforce, and that Bachelor was Clarkson. They, and others with them, laboured on; and before Wilberforce died, the work, so far as England was concerned, was done. War is not quite what it used to be. It was between district and district. It is between country and country. It has lost some of its savagery. In England, that war on a small scale, called duelling, has died in our own time.

Might not some strong will, and clear head, and warm heart, among those whose course of life is not yet fully determined, determine on this—to live for the abolition of war? And in thus speaking I do not forget that war calls forth some of our finest qualities. Many a clergyman drones away his life in petty self-indulgences. Many a soldier offers himself daily to God as a living sacrifice. But famines and pestilences have had their heroes as well as wars—and their heroines, too. They used to be thought inevitable, with a pestilence it was almost sinful to interfere.

Already it has come to pass that the mountain of the Lord's House is established as the chief of the mountains, and exalted above the hills; and many nations have flowed into it. Many peoples have gone and said—"Come ye, and let us go up to the Mountain of the Lord, to the House of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for out of Zion has gone forth the law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem. He judges between the many people, and reproves strong nations afar off." Shall not the remainder of the prophecy be accomplished? Shall not the "swords be beaten into ploughshares, and the spears into pruning-hooks"? Can we be Christians if we do not believe that a time shall come when nation shall not lift sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more?

Thus—by the accumulated thoughts of many minds, and efforts of many wills, led on by the life-giving Spirit—thus the new heaven and the new earth shall be finished, and all the host of them. "Take heed, brethren, lest haply there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief in falling away from the living God; but exhort one another day by day, so long as it is called to day; lest any one of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin; for we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end;"—the end, when Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when the new heaven and the new earth—now seen in a mirror darkly—shall be seen as they are in the mind of the Eternal—and the week of the new creation, like the week of the old—shall be crowned with a Sabbath Rest.

The Rev. W. B. Philpot requests us to make the following corrections in his sermon published in our issue of Nov. 26th:—Page 269, last line first col., *for* "giving" *read* "gaining;" page 271, second col., line 2 from bottom, *for* "precipitated" *read* "purged away."

The annual summary of British contributions to missionary societies has just been completed by Canon Scott Robertson, of Sittingbourne. It shows an increase in the total sum contributed. The separate details for each of the seventy-four societies form a small pamphlet, but the summary of the whole is as follows:—

Church of England Foreign Missions.....	£465,816
Joint Societies of Churchmen and Nonconformists	161,074
English and Welsh Nonconformist Societies	304,313
Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Societies.....	170,975
Roman Catholic Societies.....	6,772
Total British Contributions for 1880	£1,108,950

This amount does not include interest on investments, nor balances in hand at the beginning of the year, nor any foreign contributions.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1881.

THE INFLUENCE OF MARTIN LUTHER.

By the Rev. T. ARCHIBALD S. WHITE, M.A. (Oxon.), English Chaplain at Baden Baden.

There are thousands of people to whom the very name of Martin Luther is a fascination and a charm. The events of his romantic and changeful life ever excite their interest anew. There is no dulness about it. All that he wrote or said which falls in their way is read with avidity.

There are thousands of others to whom the same name is hateful as embodying opinions which go directly counter to their most cherished predilections, and as calculated to overturn (if not withstood) all that is most precious and comforting in a restful faith.

So the bone of contention which the great Reformer laid down in his lifetime, and which occasioned so much growling and snarling and fighting, has continued to be such ever since, and is likely to continue so for many a long year to come. Of that wondrous movement, which has had such deeply-rooted influences, he was *par excellence* the representative, and no one can ever mention the word "Reformation" in a religious sense without, mentally at least, referring to Dr. Martin Luther.

A strong, bold, fearless nature, a dauntless attitude, a resolute will, uncompromising words and pithy sentences, a hatred of all that was false, hypocritical, or mean, a love of God intense and steadfast, a devotion to His Sacred Word, an affection for His Church on earth, and an undying aspiration after and yearning for the joy of His presence in heaven, a joyous sense of pardon through the precious Blood of his Saviour our Lord Jesus Christ, together with a constant realisation of his own sin and unworthiness—all this goes to make up one of the most remarkable and wonderful characters which the history of Christianity affords. We miss it is true the gentleness of Christ, but so we do in Elijah or St. John Baptist. But like them he had to take the surgeon's knife; for moral and spiritual disease around him, especially in the priesthood, was deeply rooted. Like a woodman, he had to deal heavy blows with his axe; or he might be compared to a brawny blacksmith, with his anvil and hammer. He felt, and could not but feel with his convictions, that it was no time for mawkish sentimentality; he must strike while the iron was hot, and that often, and with all his force. And so we look back upon him with a wondrous interest, as upon a giant of old, whom we would fain have seen and known.

But, like all hard-strikers and free-hitters in controversial matters, his influence has been two-fold; destructive and constructive. He threw down many abuses, but also some good both in practice and doctrine. His influence has in the course of time built up much that one may without reservation admire, much of division and discord that one must unfeignedly regret. "Splitting up," "splitting up!" is what one sadly ejaculates again and again in contemplating the results of the work of which Luther is the foremost representative. No Bishops, no strong, scriptural, episcopal form of Church government. Much deep religious feeling, but weak organisation. Such is the first exclamation on contemplating the course which the stream of Lutheranism proper has taken.

It is always good, in attempting to grasp any subject, to consider the view of a strong and uncompromising opponent. Let us take then a sentence or two out of a sermon by a Roman Priest, preached on the Feast of St. Ignatius in the present year of grace, 1881.* "Luther, having declared that man was like a brute by denying his free will, nevertheless claimed for him the right of choosing for himself the doctrines which were to regulate all his acts and thoughts. After having made him an inert and passive thing, he put the Bible into his hands and said to him, 'Open and read. Whatsoever thou thinkest that thou discoverest there, that is the truth.' Thus Luther (and in this he was followed by nearly all the so-called Reformers) degraded man into a machine, but at the same time unfettered his pride, and made him the arbiter of his own salvation." (Page 8.)

This is not quite fair controversy. But doubtless the Rev. Mr. Tralee's hearers thought it was all right. Let us turn for a moment to Bishop Harold Browne's exposition of the tenth Article of the Church of England. We find the two following quotations from Luther's "Bondage of the Will":—"'In his actings towards God, in things pertaining to salvation or damnation, man has no free will, but is the captive, the subject, and the servant, either of the will of God, or of the will of Satan.' Again, 'If we believe that God foreknows and predestinates everything . . . . . it follows that there can be no such thing as free will in man or angel, or any creature.'" But, continues Bishop Browne, "These expressions are characteristic of the vehemence of Luther's temper, when opposing what he considered a dangerous error" (the doctrine of grace *de congruo*), "and are much stronger than the opinions subsequently expressed by him, and very different from the language of Melancthon and the confessions of the Lutheran churches." (Page 259, seventh edition.)

We really rub our eyes with astonishment, and wonder whether the Rev. Mr. Tralee really lives in a cell when he describes the influence of the Reformed teaching, headed by Luther as having "degraded man into a machine." Who are peopling Northern America, Australia, New Zealand, Southern Africa, and other distant parts of the world, and carrying everywhere with indescribable energy and industry commerce and civilisation, philanthropy, and above all, Gospel truth, but those who have been influenced by the Reformed teaching? It is true they resemble a machine in its activity and work. But that was not what Mr. Tralee meant, nor what a schoolmaster, a mistress of a household mean when they tell their pupils or servants they do their work like machines. Our author intended his obedient listeners to understand that the Reformed teaching is one that degrades the human intellect, curbs the powers of thought and action, and prevents the due development of the spiritual capabilities of man. We take up the glove of his challenge, and we

* A Sermon entitled "Veni mittere ignem in terram," by Rev. W. Tralee. London, Burns and Oates.

ask every intelligent and reasonable reader whether he is really telling the truth to the world (for the sermon is published to the world, price one shilling), or whether as a matter of fact the case is not all the other way.

Luther, like other Reformers in Church and State, was obliged by the very position in which his opinions had placed him, to say pungent things which he afterwards modified, and which were certainly not all echoed to the nth by his colleagues. He was obliged to do things which, as we have already pointed out, had even a destructive tendency.

This is the result in some measure of all Reformations in the Church of Christ. The reaction from a scandalous state of things has always had a destructive as well as a constructive effect. This is illustrated again in the movement of Wesley, in our own day by the preaching of Spurgeon, Henry Ward Beecher, or the meetings of Messrs. Moody and Sankey. Who doubts the earnestness or honesty of such leaders? Not I. All we say is their leadership is reactionary, and therefore almost necessarily destructive as well as constructive. But God preserves His Church, and not only so, but its Catholic structure. We might perhaps say that under Divine guidance the Episcopal form of Church Government in the line of Apostolical succession is the citadel of the fortress of Christendom. If once that were taken (which cannot be) all would be lost, and Christianity burst and disappear like a shell in warfare. It would in the concussion destroy much, construct nothing.

There is much undoubted piety among those whose lives may be called strictly Lutheran, though they have entirely lost the Episcopal form of government. There is much earnest preaching and teaching among them, in the guiding principles of which they approach closely to the Anglican Church. But there is a want of cohesion among them—always splitting, no grand, national organisation or *prestige*—no leading spirit to succeed the great Reformer, and the reason of it all appears to be the want of the Divinely ordained Episcopal form of Government. Where is the literature of the Lutheran Church, where its newspapers and reviews? What has it to compare at the present moment in this department with the Anglican Church in Great Britain, her colonies, and in the United States? And why are we not in communion with a Church that resembles us so closely? Why has all our wealth of sympathy gone off to a far different body—the old Catholics? The answer is one—always one and the same. The Episcopal form of Church government—that succession of ministers, bishops, priests, and deacons—which has descended in a direct line by laying on of hands from generation to generation since the days of Jesus Christ our Lord Himself—that is the secret of Anglican influence—the want of it constitutes the weakness of the Lutherans proper—the cause of their continual splitting up.

We wish well to our Lutheran brethren, and they wish us well. We interchange friendly offices with one another on the Continent of Europe, particularly in the German Fatherland, the stronghold of Lutheranism. But we feel ourselves bound to tell them what we feel to be the truth, that unless they return to the Episcopal form of government, taking the succession from an Apostolic Church like the Anglican, there is little chance of their becoming really united and strong. In our opinion the old Catholic Church, with its Bishop at its head, small and young though it be, is far more likely to be seen one day in Cologne Cathedral as the National Church of Germany, than the far older and more numerous and deeply-rooted body called "The Lutheran Church." It is this feeling and no other which has caused the outburst of sympathy towards Bishop Herzog in America, towards M. Loyson, and towards Bishops Reinkens and Herzog in England. We have not come to the end of this assuredly. Before long, if all goes well, we shall see M. Loyson received in the United States with open arms. Every religious movement, strong and true though it be, has its peculiar difficulties, and must be content with slow, almost doubtful progress, and eventually may suffer decline. But if we may prophesy what is about to happen in the more immediate future, we should say that Lutheranism is likely to split up and become merged into other bodies, while Old Catholicism is in all probability destined to go on and prosper.

If so, undoubtedly Episcopal, Apostolical succession is the secret talisman of respective success and failure.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I am obliged to the Rev. R. Galbraith for the courteous tone of his letter, published in your last number, and trust that he will not be offended at my saying that I see from its concluding remarks his present knowledge would require me to write a treatise on evolution before I could satisfy all his difficulties. I shall therefore in this reply—and it will evidently be useless to continue the correspondence—content myself with briefly noticing one or two remarks in his letter. I may however say that in the volume of sermons, to which I have already referred, he will find a few of his difficulties discussed.

As regards the origin of the popular ideas, of which I conceive the author of the Book of Genesis to have made some use, I fail to see the force of the difficulty which Mr. Galbraith brings forward. Ideas concerning a cosmogony exist in most nations—even among those who can hardly be supposed to have derived them from the Mosaic record. If Mr. Galbraith supposes all these to be of divine revelation, he must account for the fact that they are inconsistent one with another; if not, his objection has no force in this instance. I did not say that the first chapter of Genesis was nothing more than a popular tradition. Apparently, too, he fails to see that his particular objection requires us to attach to the word "day" its ordinary sense. I have already stated that in the opinion of one of our best Biblical scholars this meaning of the word cannot be maintained. If Mr. Galbraith concede anything like figurative or non-literal interpretation, the question becomes one not of principle but only of degree. If he elect to adhere to the strict literal interpretation of the words of the English Version, then he must reject not only the evolution hypothesis, but also a very large part of geology. Apparently he is unaware that if one thing is more certainly established by that science than another, it is that there are no breaks in the succession of animal life, such as the above interpretation would demand. Species, however produced, whether

by special creation or by evolution, make their appearance and disappear gradually. Geological Periods, as they are termed, are only of local importance; corresponding with gaps in the record which exist in particular districts. They are of value for purposes of reference and arrangement; but we know, so far as we can know under the circumstances, that the history of one country is complete where another is dilapidated, and that "breaks in succession" really mean no more than gaps in our knowledge. It is really, then, not the evolution hypothesis which is opposed to the language of Scripture, as viewed by Mr. Galbraith, but palæontology and stratigraphy—*i.e.*, a large part of geology. Indeed, as it seems to me, to be logically consistent Mr. Galbraith ought also to adopt the astronomy of the ancients, for that which is ordinarily accepted seems to me hard to reconcile with such an interpretation as he requires of the earlier Books of the Bible.

His remarks as to the bearing of "observation and experience" on the hypothesis of evolution show me that he has not studied the subject sufficiently to enter into the real force of the arguments either for or against it; and it is to a great extent on this account that I feel obliged to decline prolonging the discussion; for these arguments cannot be understood (I hope he will not be offended at my saying it) without a fair knowledge of zoology and palæontology. I may however add that although the modifying process required by the evolution hypothesis doubtless still goes on, it does not follow that it proceeds now at the same rate as it formerly did. This may perhaps partly meet Mr. Galbraith's difficulty about the "day of rest."

One word more. Perhaps Mr. Galbraith is afraid (as many are) that a belief in evolution is incompatible with a belief in a Creator. It is so, just as much and just as little as is a belief in the evolution (by natural causes, as we term them) of every human being from an unsegmented germ to a perfect man. In this process of evolution also there are periods of development—some comparatively rapid, some comparatively slow—till at last the only change is that of decay, and the end comes. These things may be more than an allegory.

T. G. BONNEY.

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO THE JEWS.

A meeting in aid of the above Mission was held in the Combination-room, King's College, Cambridge, on Monday, November 28. The Archdeacon of Ely presided; and there were present the Dean of Lichfield, the Rev. R. Sutton, Prebendary of Chichester, the Ven. Archdeacon Chapman, the Rev. J. H. Lord, the Rev. J. Greatheed, the Rev. W. H. Guillemard, the Rev. H. M. Lower, and others. After a few words from the chairman,

Prebendary Sutton read a paper on the method of the parochial Missions, and the claims of the Jews upon the Church. The promoters of the Missions have not aimed at the foundation of a new "Society," preferring to describe the effort as the commencement of a "fund" to strengthen the existing machinery of the Church, by enabling the incumbents of parishes to work among the Jewish population without the aid of an external society. The work undertaken includes (1) the special training of men for Jewish work; and (2) the granting of stipends to licensed curates specially qualified for it. The fund has aided the parishes of St. Paul's, Haggerston, St. Olave's, Mile-end, and St. Thomas', Leeds. Mr. Margoliouth, now a student at Cuddesdon, is shortly to be ordained for the work in Leeds. Two more—converts from Judaism—have offered themselves; and also a clergyman in priest's orders, who has had some years' experience as a missionary in India.

The Dean of Lichfield then explained the relation of the Parochial Missions Fund to the London Jews' Society. The latter had done good work; but his own experience of Jewish character had led him to conclude that there was a way of approaching the Jews which might lead to better results than those of the London Society. He mentioned the names of the Dean of St. Paul's and Canon Wilkinson, of St. Peter's, Eaton-square, who had arrived at the same conclusion, and this from personal experience. They had been amongst the first who commenced the fund. When he was himself vicar of Aylesbury he had seen something of the wealthy Jews in Bucks. The late Sir A. Rothschild called upon him with a donation of 100 guineas to the fund for the restoration of the church, saying that the Jews regarded it as the duty of men of property to support the Established Church. Other friendly acts during his tenure of the office of Archdeacon suggested that the parochial system of the Church was the way to approach the Jews. Out of seven millions of Jews throughout the world there are about 80,000 Jews in England. These Jews are all massed together in certain densely populated districts. There are about 1,500 in Mile-end, and about the same number in Leeds. Thus they are found mostly within definite limits, and about thirty well qualified men would suffice for the work, and an income of £3,000 or £4,000 would meet all the demand. He concluded by quoting a saying of Lord Beaconsfield, who, when asked whether he was a Jew or a Christian, had replied, "Sir, I am a developed Jew." Christianity was "developed Judaism."

The Rev. J. H. Lord, curate of St. Olave's, Mile End, stated that in his own district, and in the neighbouring district of Spitalfields, the number of Jews reached 8,000 or 9,000. There was a great influx of foreign Jews, mostly immigrants from Poland, to avoid the military laws. These he had found a more accessible class than the English Jews. There are three classes of Jews in his district:—(1) the orthodox Rabbinical Jews; (2) the rationalistic; (3) the ignorant. He spoke of the good that might be done by visiting the Jews at their houses, and by public lectures. He mentioned cases of a repulse at the first visit being followed by a welcome subsequently. Such would be more likely to be the experience of the parochial clergy than of the agents of an independent Mission. He spoke of the peculiar difficulties of the Jews in attending the schools or lectures of the Parochial Mission, and how any who were suspected of apostasy would be watched by their Jewish neighbours. He urged that the Jews were a people in whom religious ideas were predominant, and as such they presented a favourable contrast to the irreligious tone of many nominal Christians in the masses around them.

The Rev. J. Greatheed, late Missionary in Indore, spoke of the Jews in India and America. A Christian lady had a school for Jewish children in Bombay. The aim of this effort was not primarily to make converts, but to cultivate their religious impulses, and to lead them to seek God for themselves. The great hope in India was not to be found in the results of Mission work now carried on, but in the prospect of the Hindûs

at some future time coming in as a body to Christ—such an ingathering as was looked for in the case of the Jews. We had to co-operate with the Holy Spirit in the work of corporate conversion. The Jews had been embittered by harsh treatment; there were signs of this even in America. Dean Milman's three words, "literature, persecution, industry," were very expressive of their character and history. He had been much impressed by the deeply religious character of the people, when he had attended their services in America; they spent five or six hours in their synagogues on festival days. As for extortion, frauds on a large scale and the worst forms of commercial depravity were unheard of amongst them.

The Rev. R. Sutton spoke of his experience of a parish in Aldgate, in which there were some eight thousand Jews. The parochial clergy had taken interest in their customs and observances, but had attempted no evangelistic work amongst them. This had convinced him of the great necessity for a supply of clergy specially qualified for such work.

The Rev. C. F. Tobias, from Kimberley, South Africa, said that he had been brought up by Jewish parents. Jews were often irritated by the arrogant behaviour of Christians towards them, especially as many of these Christians were irreligious in their own lives. The Jews must be approached with respect for their religious convictions. He could confirm from his own father's testimony, the statement that it was no shock to a Jew's prejudices to be visited by the parochial clergy.

The Rev. J. Chapman, rector of Milton, spoke of his recollections of the Rev. C. Simeon, his zeal for the conversion of the Jews, and his works on prophecy bearing on the subject. He had supported the London society for more than forty years, but the method of the Parochial Missions appeared to him the better plan for carrying on the work.

The Rev. C. B. Birks, vicar of Trumpington, urged that the claims of both societies should be recognised, as they did not cover the same ground—the whole of the foreign work being still in the hands of the London Society. The London Society had also in some instances acted upon the lines of the Parochial Missions. A committee was formed consisting of the Archdeacon of Ely, the Master of Christ's College, Mr. Birks, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Churton, and others, to arrange a public meeting in Cambridge in April, 1882, and the thanks of the meeting were given to the speakers, and to the Provost and Fellows of King's College, for the loan of the Combination-room.

Reviews and Notices.

"Non-Miraculous Christianity," and other Sermons. By George Salmon, D D., Chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. London: Macmillan and Co. 1881. Pp. viii 295.

The sermons in this interesting volume will repay attentive perusal; and indeed, like Bishop Butler's and Canon Mozley's, to which they are somewhat akin, they require more than a transient passage through the ear for an adequate appreciation of their trains of close reasoning. Being academical rather than popular, having been, with apparently a single exception, addressed to audiences of students, the reader must not expect to find in them the brilliant and emotional rhetoric which sways the multitude; but if he desires sound instruction, accurate discrimination between current religious opinions, and searching exposure of sceptical fallacies, he will meet here with a great deal on which he may meditate with profit. The measured calmness which pervades them is by no means a sign of intellectual feebleness or hesitation; combined as it is with an abundant knowledge of the latest movements of thought, and a subtle and penetrating criticism, it gives the impression of conscious strength moving steadfastly, and without haste, to its goal. Perhaps it is in the first half of the volume where the controversy with modern forms of unbelief is handled, that this characteristic is most prominent; still, in the miscellaneous discourses which follow, we are not seldom struck with the quiet force with which errors are exposed, and tangled webs of thought are made straight.

The sermon from which the volume takes its title strikes us as the most noteworthy of all. Addressing the University of Cambridge, where modern science finds an especial home, Dr. Salmon grapples with that phase of thought, begotten of science, which endeavours by a critical disintegration of the sacred documents to frame a Christianity that shall be free from the incumbrance of the miraculous. If Jesus really did rise from the dead, he argues, His religion cannot possibly be emptied of miracle. But whatever criticism may surmise respecting a primitive Gospel of earlier date than our extant records, a Gospel which does not tell of a resurrection is a sheer impossibility; our chronology is unable to find a place for it. "At the very earliest date that we can imagine the history of our Lord's life put into writing, the story of the Resurrection must have come to form an essential part of it." Hence "a non-miraculous Christianity is as much a contradiction in terms as a quadrangular circle. . . . It is not the religion which the Apostles preached; it is not that into which converts were baptized; it is not that for which martyrs gave their lives." He then goes on to point out that the real question is, "What think you of Christ?" If He was a person altogether unique in the history of humanity, as His Church has always claimed for Him, then it is idle to talk of clearing away the supernatural from Christianity. "There is in Christianity but one miracle, the appearance in the world of a supernatural Person." Deny this, and what becomes of our religion? "If Christ be man, to lead us to Christ is a miserable halting place. Then to lead us to Christ means this: To arrest the growth of the science of religion at the point at which it arrived eighteen centuries ago, to throw our thoughts on the past instead of on the future, and to say that at the end of a period when the human intellect has been exerted with unexampled activity, when literature and science have been cultivated as they never have been before, we are to be content to sit at the feet of a highly gifted Jewish teacher who died two thousand years ago."

In a subsequent sermon, entitled "A Scientific Test Applied to Atheistic Theories of Religion," we find some admirable specimens of the way in which the tables may be turned on the sceptic. Thus for instance in regard to his cry for truth at all cost: Tell me not, he says, of the beauty or the utility of Christianity; is it true? Better the ugliest truth than the most beautiful lie that ever was invented. "Most heartily," says Dr. Salmon, "do I sympathize with such a feeling. . . . . Experience has proved to us that belief in no lie can

really benefit the world. Well then, does it not follow conversely, that if a belief really benefits the world it cannot be a lie?" And that this is the case with Christianity, there can hardly be a dispute. For "only imagine what a world it would be if every one in it were not in name only, but in heart a Christian," &c. So also, when the sceptic undertakes to explain philosophically the undeniable efficacy of prayer. "When you ask God," he says, "to give you grace and strength, you are really invoking a nonentity. The grace and strength, it is true, come, but they do so in virtue of the laws of the action of your own mind, and not by any influence from without." The retort is admirable. "If a man knows the true theory of anything he is the better able to do the thing. You say you know the true theory of prayer. Well, then pray; he can't. If the instincts of his nature surprise him into prayer, he is obliged for the time to put his theory out of his mind. If he thinks of it he smiles at his own inconsistency. He blushes if he is caught on his knees, and starts to his feet with lame apologies."

In a sermon on the parable of the sower, where we should scarcely expect to find it, is a brief but striking exposure of the absurdity of some of the coarser materialists in saying that "the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile." "No secreting organ in our system," urges Dr. Salmon, "creates that which it secretes. Every particle of bile given out by the liver must have been contained in that which entered into the liver. Is it so with the thoughts? Can we find them in the blood which courses along our veins and arteries, and which, entering into the blood-vessels of the brain, sustains the activity of that organ? Will a delicate analysis ever detect them in the food whence that blood was derived, and thus show that the brain does nothing but disentangle these thoughts from the envelope which had concealed them? Can we imagine that, in the progress of science, it will be discovered how the diet is to be varied, according as the production we desire to obtain is the poet's fine imagination, or the philosopher's deep speculation, or the mother's fond affection, or the martyr's stern resolve?"

We had marked some striking passages in the later sermons, but our space forbids further quotation, and will only allow a reference to the discussion in the concluding discourse respecting the date of St. James's Epistle. Dr. Salmon gives some reasons for holding it to be "the earliest document in the New Testament," prior in date to the Mission of Paul and Barnabas to the heathens. The question is one on which there is great difference of opinion among modern commentators, some like Dr. Salmon advocating as early a date as A.D. 45, others bringing it down to nearly the close of St. James's life, but a few years before the fall of Jerusalem. We certainly agree with Dr. Salmon in the view that in the famous chapter on Justification, St. James is not combating St. Paul's doctrine; and that the choice lies between a period before that Apostle's conflict with the Judaizers arose, and a period when it had practically died away. To our mind the internal evidence rather points to the latter, for at the earlier time it is difficult to see how there could exist sufficient communities of Christian Jews "scattered abroad," to give occasion for a circular Epistle to them; and the notices of social and moral disorganization, accompanied by warnings of impending judgment seem rather to belong to a time, when the eastern world was already heaving with the throes which preceded the break-up of Judaism. But the question is still open for enquiry.

'SINS OF THE FLESH": A Sermon preached in Clifton College Chapel, July 18, 1880. By the Rev. J. M. Wilson, M.A., Head Master. Published at the request of the Social Purity Alliance, Croydon.

"PURITY": An Address to Men, delivered in Lincoln Cathedral, Sept. 19, 1879. By the Rev. R. G. Bulkeley, Vicar of St. John's, Dukinfield, Cheshire. Third Edition. Social Purity Alliance, Croydon.

These two discourses treat of a subject in the handling of which there is an obvious danger of doing more harm than good: so much so, that very many people will think it better left alone altogether, or at any rate, not directly alluded to in the pulpit. Such has been the policy generally followed until within a very recent period. We do not go so far as to say that the matter is to be excluded from public teaching altogether: there are special occasions, special congregations, where the preacher may feel it his positive duty to deal with it; and there are also, no doubt, some preachers who are capable of dealing with it faithfully, powerfully, and yet discreetly. But we must certainly deprecate anything like a tendency to make the subject too common; and especially any gratuitous assumption that the evil itself is well-nigh universal. The general character of the youth and manhood of our country is surely sufficient to refute such a reproach, and the mere suggestion of such an idea cannot fail to be mischievous. The wisest course appears to be to deal with the subject of moral and personal purity as a whole, and to touch upon individual points as far as occasion may require, without giving undue prominence to matters of which the Apostle himself says, *αἰσχρόν ἐστι καὶ λέγειν*. If, however, the subject must be undertaken, Mr. Wilson's sermon, preached in the Chapel of Clifton College, is as good a model of such an address as we could desire; short, vigorous, earnest, and sympathizing, and,—which is a great point,—stirring up his hearers with a noble enthusiasm to aim at a high standard of personal honour. "I would rather hear it said of Clifton boys," he exclaims, "that their presence was a guarantee for purity in whatever society they found themselves, than that they won every other honour the world has to bestow."

Mr. Bulkeley's address to men, delivered in Lincoln Cathedral, is directed to the same object; and though lacking the terse vigour of the other sermon, appeals earnestly and sympathetically to the consciences of his hearers. His congregation also being of a somewhat different character from that addressed in a College Chapel, he is able to take a somewhat wider view of his subject.

As a practical matter, it can hardly be doubted that one of the most powerful safeguards against the dangers here referred to, in all their forms, is the presence of a pure and honourable attachment to one of the other sex: and therefore, when anything of this sort exists, if not absolutely mischievous and impracticable, it should not be too rudely or severely forbidden, as is often done, merely on grounds of worldly prudence and ambition. This consideration, though it may not be thought a motive of the highest and most spiritual character, and though preachers may therefore hesitate to dwell upon it in their pulpits, yet at least it is consistent with St. Paul's well-known advice, that in order to avoid fornication, every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband; and it appears therefore a suitable application of his words to those who for the present can only look forward to the married state at a distance.

SUPPLEMENT.

Vol. XII.—No. 311. SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1881.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

WE must now close the discussion on these Acts. Inasmuch as they are designed to prevent an incurable disease which deteriorates the *morale* as well as the *physique* of families for several generations, we have felt it to be our solemn duty to allow a full and free discussion of them in our pages, in order to ascertain whether they are contrary to the mind and will of God as revealed in the Bible. In doing this we regret to have offended some of our subscribers, who hold that the morality or immorality of these laws should be left to experts to decide. Their opinion may be right, but the opponents of the Acts will not consent to it; they held a series of public meetings in London during last July to denounce the Acts, without, as far as we could learn, suggesting any other means of preventing seduction, prostitution, and their attendant crimes of infanticide, suicide, and sometimes murder, to say nothing of the insidious leprosy which is thereby conveyed to innocent wives and children. We do not by any means regard the Acts as perfect, and believe they might be much improved in detail. It is Utopian to expect that they will ever suppress entirely the *moral* evil. This must be done by preachers boldly exposing the sin and its disastrous consequences, and by the State vigorously obviating the causes, and suppressing the temptations, that lead to it. On this account we have permitted opponents and others to suggest and defend any substitutes for them which they think would effect a more radical cure. Having resided for some time, and seen something of harem-life, in a Mahomedan country, we expressed an opinion that polygamy would be the most effectual remedy of those suggested. But this is quite impracticable at present, as the feeling of the nation is that it is contrary to the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles. The only alternative appears to be the maintenance and extension of the Acts, or their repeal and the consignment of all naval and military stations to their former blatant prostitution, and by consequence the increased spread of insidious disease through all ranks of society. We trust that in former articles we have fairly met the arguments against the necessary one-sidedness and punitive character of the Acts. Some have argued that the "unfortunates" are cruelly and inhumanly, others that they are too indulgently, treated in the Government Lock Hospitals. We have visited the Hospitals in London, Devonport, and Chatham, and can aver that there is no truth in either of these mutually contradictory statements. Inasmuch as they are temporarily deprived of their liberty, like small-pox or fever patients, for the State purpose of not spreading a highly contagious disease, they ought not, and cannot be treated as prisoners and misdemeanants. At the same time, as very many of them are able to follow industrial occupations such as laundry, cooking, dress-making, gardening work, or tending poultry, etc., there is no reason why they should not be invited to join in these humanising works, which, being of God's ordinance, are as likely to reclaim them as the ministrations of the Chaplains. The country is deeply indebted to the Lady Superintendents of these Hospitals for initiating and sustaining these voluntary occupations for an abandoned class. Numbers of young girls are reclaimed in these institutions. The Lock Hospital at Chatham is a model institution. The Lady Superintendent, Miss Webb, takes a personal interest in all the women, and is looked upon and obeyed as a Mother Superior. We attended a service in the Chapel there, which was heartily and impressively joined in by all the women, with Miss Webb leading the singing and presiding at the harmonium, when the Chaplain gave a short, vigorous, suitable, and impressive sermon. Surely such means of grace and forgiveness cannot be entirely unheeded by any class of women however degraded. We trust that opponents will not follow Miss Bewicke's advice, and content themselves with agitating only for repeal, but will bring forward some substitute for such beneficent Acts. Our Lord enjoined His disciples to heal the sick and cleanse the lepers, not less than to declare the Kingdom of Heaven.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—"Amicus," writing in your paper of Nov. 26, with reference to the "trespass of Onan," asks for an expression of medical opinion as to whether health is prejudicially affected by the practice alluded to. May I be permitted to refer him to a pamphlet by C. H. F. Routh, M.D., on the "Moral and physical evils likely to follow, if practices intended to act as checks to population be not strongly discouraged and condemned" (Baillière, Tindall, and Cox, 1879). On page 11 we read:—"Like all crimes it (conjugal onanism) cannot be, and it is not practised with impunity. The effect on the health of both men and women is very injurious."

The writer then proceeds, basing his remarks upon Bergeret's "*Des fraudes dans l'accomplissement des fonctions genetrices*," to enumerate some of the diseases induced by such "frauds," a terrible catalogue indeed, but suited rather for the pages of a medical journal than for your columns. I may, however, quote one clause,—"Among men, general nervous prostra-

tion, mental decay, loss of memory, intense cardiac palpitations, mania, conditions which also lead to suicide, are given as the results of conjugal onanism."

On page 13 he says, moreover,—"These habits are injurious in other ways. 1. They lead to a diminution of population. 2. They produce a deterioration in the physical strength of a race, and they bring about great demoralisation." These effects he proves by statistics which will be found upon subsequent pages of the pamphlet, wherein also "Amicus" will find the following opinion of an American physician, Dr. Marion Sims of New York:—"I have seen any number of women whose health was ruined by this conjugal onanism. And I have seen several whose health was promptly restored by persuading the husband and wife to live together as husband and wife should live. We cannot rudely violate any of the great laws of nature with impunity. And the nervous system of the strong man will as certainly break down under these abuses, as will that of his delicate and refined wife" (p. 23). And there is much more from other medical authorities, which I would commend to the consideration of any who may be sceptical as to the temporal penalties which follow the act.

As regards the moral question raised by your correspondent, viz., whether the act when "between man and wife with mutual consent" is of a sinful nature, he would appear to be at issue with Dr. Routh. "Amicus" has "never heard any sensible reason" why it should be so regarded. The doctor gives the following (p. 10):—"I look upon conjugal onanism as a great moral crime. It is perverting a noble attribute to vicious propensities. It is feeding a lustful impulse, and in the most degrading manner lowering the status of a woman. It is even doing that which an animal, actuated solely by instinct, would never do. It is destroying in the beginning what, under God's blessing, might have matured into a living soul and proved a blessing to humanity. . . . . Conjugal onanism places both the man and the woman below the instincts of the brute creation." Further, with reference to "Amicus's" confession of his inability to imagine *how* ill consequences can arise from these habits, it seems to me sufficient for us to know that such consequences *do* follow them; but there are not wanting theories upon the subject, which may be found in various medical treatises, but which, however, it is impossible to quote here. But apart from these, is it not a matter of fact that within the range of our ordinary daily experience we meet with many things governed by natural laws of which we know the results rather than the operation? Why, indeed, should *any* unlawful indulgence entail penal consequences, seeing that many of such indulgences are merely, *as acts*, the exercise of natural functions? In some instances, truly, we can assign physiological or other reasons, in others the operating *cause* is obscure but the resultant *effect* none the less certain, and we have therefore to judge by such effect as to the morality or immorality of the acts which produce it. I must not trespass upon your space to argue this point, but I would ask whether it is not a natural conclusion, having regard to the evil results which undoubtedly follow this breach of physical and moral law, that the thing is in itself sinful, albeit we can neither see *why* it should not be permissible, nor *how* it so acts as to be prejudicial to the individual and to society. I enclose my card, but would prefer to be known to your readers as

29th November, 1881. CIVIS.

SIR,—"An Inhabitant of Chatham" would do well next time, before going to a meeting or writing about it, to note its subject, and by whom it is held. Our meetings at Chatham and Rochester were not held by the "Ladies Association for the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts," there being no such society, as far as I know, but as stated on the bills, by "The Ladies National Association for the Abolition of Government Regulation of Vice." Government regulation exists in Hong-Kong, where the English Government derives a revenue from licencing houses of ill-fame; in India, where it *procures* women for our regiments on arrival and removal; and in Belgium, and other countries of Europe, as also in England, since the Acts of 1866 and 1869 about women were passed. We seek the abolition of this system, wherever it exists, and consider ourselves alike pledged to oppose it everywhere. The other remarks in an "Inhabitant of Chatham's" letter, she will find answered in my previous letter, if she will read it more carefully than she apparently read the notices of our meetings. I most fully agree with "An Irishwoman's" letter that polygamy being impracticable, its discussion is not edifying. Unless actuated by high motives men are not likely to abandon promiscuous fornication, for the more expensive method of supporting any number of wives. The support of one is already too often more than a profligate is equal to.

"J. W. A.," may be interested in hearing that the Society for the Improvement of Public Morals, of which I was hon. sec., has just ceased to exist, owing to want of support on the part of the public. There is therefore plenty of room for such a society as he advocates, if funds are forthcoming, and above all *men* ready to do their portion of work in connection with it. "A Surgeon" wrote some while back in terms that touched me so much of the need of more and better hospital accommodation for women sick from the consequences of a vicious life, that I hope he will be glad to hear that we rarely, if ever, hold a Women's Repeal meeting without urging on our audience the need for Voluntary Hospital accommodation for such cases. A. E. N. BEWICKE,

15, Campden Hill Road, W., Nov. 27th, 1881.

SIR,—If the repeated assertion of "Amicus" that Onan's sin was simply one of fraud can be substantiated, then the judgment of the Church in the past and present, as far as I have been able to discern it, has been at fault; see on Genesis xxxviii. "Annotations on Old and New Testament." 1651; also Math. Poole's Commentary on same and Synopsis, to which he refers in English commentary; also Matt. Henry, which I refer to, having them beside me at this moment. I know that at least some godly and learned men of the present day think with them on this subject.

In addition to reasons stated on page 180 of your paper, I wish to ask if the course approved by "Amicus" be not sinful, upon what grounds can it be said that onanism in the ordinary acceptation of the term, if practised in moderation, is sinful? And what is the sin of uncleanness, as distinct from fornication and adultery? Medical men do at times suggest it I know—but that does not show that it is well-pleasing to God—it seems to shew that the subject should be discussed, and I know no more fit place than your useful supplement.

ANOTHER CLERGYMAN AND PATERFAMILIAS.

[We have perused many medical authorities on the

subject, and have never met with one who advocated anything so unnatural and displeasing to God as onanism. They have all agreed with Drs. Routh and Marion Sims, as quoted by "Civis," that such practices are attended by physical injury to both male and female, and inasmuch as we expressed the same opinion to our present correspondent on page 232, we think for the credit of the medical profession he ought to authenticate his statement.—ED.]

SIR,—The pressing question to be considered is this, "What is to be done with our surplus female population?"

Forbid marriage to a large body of men and polygamy to all women, and prostitution is the inevitable result. This is just what the State is answerable for. It prohibits those relations of the sexes which God enjoins or allows, and it allows the great evil which God condemns, and that by which the greatest suffering comes upon our race in its innocent, as well as its guilty, portion. This conduct may be considerate towards the men who are debarred from matrimony, but it brings terrible temptation to the weaker vessel. It is in the interests of women, not of men, except in special cases, that I have ventured to suggest polygamy for public discussion, and I shall be glad, if in error, to be corrected, for I have in my advice to the erring long followed the line of thought pursued by me in these letters, teaching that sexual connection involves perpetual obligation, not indeed to sensual indulgence, but to the other duties which pertain mutually to those who have become "one flesh."

The illustration given by "L.S.C.," by way of refuting my arguments, fails to carry conviction with it, and I still believe that if the State may forbid marriage, and thereby make prostitution a necessity, there is no reason why it should also forbid polygamy to women and thus multiply prostitutes.

Let us represent by a town the whole nation, or the whole world if you will. A number of people wish to hire houses, but the authorities of the place monopolize the vacant houses. The disappointed ones next seek for lodgings in occupied houses. What would be said if the authorities refused to permit the homeless ones to have the apartments open to them? Would they not be held responsible for all the sin and misery which would result from their cruel conduct? So the State sins in saying to respectable females, You may not have soldiers for husbands; you may not enter into polygamous unions either; but you may become outcasts for the convenience of men, and for the ruin of multitudes.

We are told that 999·9 out of every 1,000 Christian people are against polygamy, but it is very damning to this mighty majority that they also tolerate two gross violations of the law of God—enforced celibacy and prostitution; or else why not rise in their might to prevent these evils? The despised one in ten thousand who favours polygamy in the present distress, would go with them heartily in the righteous crusade. But we cannot help suspecting the character of that sort of Christianity which pours out all the vials of its wrath on polygamy, but lets the Upas tree of prostitution and the causes of it flourish under their righteous noses. With them public sentiment seems the great point; the warranty of Scripture of little account comparatively.

But perhaps the arithmetic of "L. S. C." is as faulty as his logic. Glance at his illustration. His justly restricted servants are made to signify our unjustly restricted soldiers—a restriction in accordance with God's word a parallel to a restriction contrary to God's word, which is absurd.

Again, he makes his servants, who are permitted in libertinism contrary to God's word, or the spirit of it, to go on all fours with those who are permitted to do a thing for which there is abundant warranty of Scripture, which also is absurd. "L. S. C." begs the question, too, in assuming that polygamy is a wicked thing, worse even than forbidding to marry—worse than prostitution some of your correspondents seem to think it. But in vain do I search the black catalogues of sins given in the New Testament for the sin of polygamy. Why is this? Was St. Paul ignorant of the existence of polygamy; or, if he did know of it, was he afraid to denounce it? No; but he did not make that to be a sin which God allowed. He was too consistent a theologian for that.

Indeed, instead of drawing tighter the bands of God's laws, and augmenting their burden, the New Testament, whilst it brings back to light their comprehensiveness, affords evident relaxations of them; as, for example, in the words of our Lord about the Sabbath, and the decisions of the Jerusalem Council. Polygamy is but one of these divinely warranted relaxations. Yours, &c.,

CLK.

P.S.—If my memory may be trusted, your definition of adultery agrees with that of Archbishop Secker, in his lecture on the Seventh Commandment; and the connection between the material and spiritual aspects of the subject is easily understood.

SIR,—I had not intended contributing to the discussion any further, but feel obliged to do so now because of unaccountable misrepresentation. Having asked "Cui Bono" why the law should not interfere, he replies mainly in condemnation of the Contagious Diseases Acts; I may therefore assume that I am included amongst their supporters. I shall simply again refer him to the letters I have written for your paper dating from the 13th August. I have gone over that weary ground with bitter pain, it is unnecessary now to traverse it, but I would ask him again, and all who object, why should not the moral and civil law work together? I am a "repealer" indeed, but do not belong to the party amongst them who are so stone blind as not to see that just and salutary laws are necessary as regards this vital matter. Because it has been said that the law is an educator, it is unfair to assume that it is to educate for harm and not for good; on the contrary, it is one of the most powerful agents for quickening the conscience of a people, and undoubtedly "stems the tide of immorality." The proof of this is that sins against morality, which are also against the common law, are considered wrong, and a disgrace; but legal sins are not looked on in the same light, but are regarded by the popular mind merely as a natural necessity, and are universally committed. The tares will always grow with the wheat in this world, and the wicked will always be ready to seize at the opportunity to do evil; the law steps in to take away that opportunity. If there was no necessity for the application of the civil law to support the moral, and if religion alone was enough, then, logically, all law founded on morality would be unnecessary. There would be no need of a marriage law, or a law against bigamy, murder, &c. When men were emerging from savagery, they found it necessary to enact laws to curb men's immoral

and selfish desires. I would ask in all seriousness, if the common law has been found not only effectual, but indispensable in order to support the Eighth Commandment, and others, why it should be neutral as regards the Seventh.

The opponents of the Contagious Diseases Acts have, I think, proved that these Acts are wrong, on moral, physical, and constitutional grounds. They have endeavoured to prove them wrong morally, in order that all Christians should be awakened to their corrupt influence; physically, because there are some who will only look at the material side of the question. Those who have had any doubts on the subject, need no longer hesitate after having read some of the results of Miss Bewicke's most valuable experience, and the incontrovertible statistics brought forward by her. The Acts are at best but an ugly patch on a rotten garment, which instead of mending it only makes the rent worse. You have shifted your ground, no doubt because you see they will not bring about the result you desire. It is impossible that an amelioration of what is in itself incurable, could be a sure preventive against contagion. If prevented in some instances, these are but a bit or fragment of a whole; it is short-sighted not to think of where the tide of consequences with its ever-widening circles will leave us. If morality is sapped at its foundations, the aggregate results would end in infinitely greater moral and physical evil. I have heard some citizens of Cork complain lately of the unpleasantness of walking in the streets of the suburban districts because of the increased influx of objectionable characters. The moral part of the community do not do enough, either in condemnation of the guilty or in endeavouring to reclaim the lost. However, making the protection of vice a public institution is not the way to do it. It is indeed a "mockery" to attempt the reformation of an abandoned one, when the main, and palpable object in (partially) "curing" her, is that she may continue in sin with greater convenience to herself and others. The supporters of that system gloss over the moral wrong; they never consider the enormity of the crime. Women of that class care not how they encourage the violation of what should be the most sacred domestic ties; they "prey on garbage." An ordinary murderer destroys only *one*, it is only *one* act committed by *one* person; in the other case these three features are multiplied *ad libitum*. These are the "poor creatures" that have the "kind sympathies of the matron or lady superintendent." This maudlin sentimentality becomes revolting when the sufferings of innocent wives and children are for the most part ignored. In vain do we wait for some claim for legal protection for married women from an *incurable* injury. There is no legal penalty for those who commit that wrong.

I would remind "A Surgeon" that the instance he brought forward is not a parallel case. From the fact of the woman meriting death by stoning, we are justified in assuming she was married. We are only told of the one transgression, for which she seemed truly penitent; neither did our Lord treat the sin as being less wrong in man than in woman. There is really no comparison between the one case and the other.

AN IRISHWOMAN.

P.S.—I believed that I had refuted polygamy on Scriptural grounds (principally from the New Testament, it being the later and more transcendental revelation) before I incidentally alluded to the teaching of the great political economist. If a truth is true, it will be true in all its parts—the radii extend far and wide. Political economy is not the least important belonging to the present question.

On Saturday last the Rev. G. Stopford Ram, of St. Ann's, Highgate, was instituted as vicar of St. Peter's, Bournemouth. In the course of his address the Bishop of Winchester entreated the congregation to sympathise and co-operate with their new vicar; to be patient and forbearing, and to make his work among them lighter than it would be if they did not try to cultivate peace one among the other. Speaking generally on Church matters, his lordship said he believed the future of the English Church very much depended upon the present generation, and concluded by remarking:—"One generation more of peace, purity, earnest labour, and devoted love, faith in Christ, and hope of heaven, may make the Church of England strong, pure, more beautiful, and the joy of the whole world. But, one generation more of that which threatens us—one generation more of scepticism and of sensual life, luxury, intemperance, and impurity, which are also accompanying the scepticism of the present age to a very singular degree, and cause division among ourselves—one more generation of that, and it is possible that the candlestick on which so much light has been elevated for so many centuries in this land may be removed from us."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barclay, Rev. H. W., curate of Great Yeldham, Essex.
Butcher, Rev. S. J., curate of Westhide, Hereford.
Cheetham, Right Rev. Dr., bishop of Sierra Leone; vicar of Rotherham.
Clarke, Rev. Arthur Frederic, vicar of Cockerham.
Coxe, Rev. Seymour R., vicar of Brompton; rector of Baconsthorpe, Norfolk.
Daly, Rev. H. Vincent, rector of Gort; archdeacon of Clonfert.
Davies, Rev. E. T., incumbent of St. David's, Brownlow-hill, Liverpool; vicar of Aberdovey, Merionethshire.
Eliot, Rev. Charles John, vicar of Foleshill, near Coventry.
Harrison, Rev. J. D., vicar of Barton; chaplain to Fulwood Workhouse.
Hope, Rev. James, rector of St. Margaret, Whalley Range.
Powles, Rev. George, vicar of Weeton.
Rowe, Rev. David, rector of St. Lawrence, Denton.
Saunders, Rev. Arthur Cardinal, vicar of Magor-with-Redwick; rector of Lydiard Millicent.
Sayers, Rev. Robert, rector of Roughton, Norfolk; vicar of Rathby-with-Groby.
Thomson, Rev. Henry Morton, assistant-chaplain H.M. Prison, Strangeways, Manchester; chaplain H.M. Prison, Norwich.
Warren, Rev. F. E., rector of Frenchay, Bristol.
Wills, Rev. Samuel R., recor of Rathkeale; prebendary in Llmerick Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bingham, Rev. Canon Charles William, for thirty-nine years rector of Melcombe Horsey, at Bingham's, Melcombe, on the 1st inst., aged 71.
Carter, Rev. Charles Clement, fifth son of the Rev. William Carter, rector of Slingsby, Yorkshire, suddenly, at Bournemouth, on the 29th ult., aged 31.
Dunbar, Rev. Sir William, Bart., at Dummer Rectory, Basingstoke, on the 27th ult., aged 77.
Heaven, Rev. William Henry, M.A., vicar of Netheravon, Wilts, on the 3rd inst., aged 55.
Jerram, Rev. James, formerly rector of Fleet, at Fleet Rectory, very suddenly, on the 30th ult., aged 77.
Reyroux, Rev. Frederick, B.D., at Appleford, Abingdon, on the 5th inst., aged 81.
Spring, Rev. Frederick James, retired chaplain, Bombay Establishment, and late vicar of Corton, Suffolk, at 4, Delamere-street, Westbourne-square, W., on the 26th ult., aged 68.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD, NOT IN WORD, BUT IN POWER.

By the Very Rev. R. W. CHURCH, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, London.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, Nov. 6th, 1881.

"The Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power."—1 Cor. iv. 20.

OF him who wrote these words, these words are plainly true. Of St. Paul it is as certain as anything can be, that this contrast expressed the truth about the business to which his life was given. It was, in the first place, not a name but a thing, not a profession but a conviction, not an opinion to be talked about, but a truth to live and die for. But there is more than this. Beyond the opposition of mere words and professions and names to reality, there is the opposition between things which are, and our theories and speculations about them. And here, again, St. Paul held to his contrast. The Kingdom of God had come into the world of experience, and work, and fact, and was come to take its part there. The Kingdom of God was not a philosophy, not even a divine philosophy, but a living force, to try its strength against the other forces, coarse or subtle, of human life. It was not merely a great idea, but an imperious and self-acting law to each man's life; not a speculative system of the universe or of morals, coördinating causes, accounting for results, but the weight and power of an actual movement, outside of man, which could change and govern wills, and acts, and events. It was not something within the domain of human thinking to shape and deal with, but something apart from all thought about it, with a substantive and independent existence of its own.

There are such things—we know them, and he knew them. The kingdoms of this world, the empire of the Cæsars, the forms and organisations of society in his day, were not in word but in power. You might dispute about them. You might hate, or you might admire and praise them. You might acquiesce in them, or resist them. But, after all said and done, you were but a thinker and talker about them, and they were the things that are. Such to St. Paul was the "Kingdom of God," the "Gospel of Christ," the "Church of God." Nature is not in word but in power. The family is not in word but in power. Morality is not in word but in power. Law is not in word but in power. Take them away, and it is a different world—not a world that we know, not a world which we can well imagine one knowing. True, we are accustomed to them; but beyond custom, nature is, and the family, and morality, and law. And so to St. Paul's life and convictions was the "Kingdom of God." It was the necessary complement to all that was in the world. Once, he had known the world without it: henceforth he could no more know the world without it than a blind man whose eyes were opened could know the world without the light.

Except to the few who knew what St. Paul knew, and thought as he did, it was, at the time, a bold saying; not too bold for what he put his conviction upon, but bold according to the appearances of the time. But, indeed, it was not a whit too bold. The course of events has amply verified his belief. As a fact in the history of the world, the "Kingdom of God" which he preached, has been, if ever anything was, "not in word but in power." And mankind, unbelieving as well as believing, have not ceased wondering at it.

May I, then, invite you to consider for a few minutes this very obvious and common-place subject, contained in St. Paul's words, that "The Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power;" it is not a supposition, but a fact; not a theory, a speculative system, but a reality, which we cannot help and cannot undo, and which we cannot make to be just what we like, in the existing order of things which we know. There is use, sometimes, in bringing ourselves face to face with assumed, and obvious, and accepted things. We are always in danger of straying away, under the temptations and interests of thinking, from plain, rude reality. Our ingenuity builds up, or developes, or destroys, forgetful that what we are operating upon, as we think, so skilfully, goes on its way, not heeding our thoughts about it any more than the suns which rise and set. You argue triumphantly that a thing is this way, or that way, or that it cannot be, that it is dead; and lo, in spite of all that ought to follow, it lives. *Eppur si muove.* The things which we least notice, because they are so familiar, so undoubted, are often the things that most need and deserve our attention.

The contrast between the reality of a thing and men's thoughts about it runs through all our life in every department of it. Every one, according to the place which he occupies, is conscious of it. The merchant, the lawyer, the man of science, the engineer, the sailor, all know it well, when they come into contact with what is outside their own world; but the contrast is not limited to merely professional or technical matters. Whenever men touch real things, there is seen and felt the difference in knowledge and mental attitude. Take the way in which we think and speak of a person whom we know by books or

report, and then the difference, when we come to know the living man by face, and expression, and voice, and behaviour, in all the unimagined variety of the shades and hues of his character, all the compensations for what we disliked, all the abatements from what we admired, all the changeful play of affections or of mood, all the richness, if the life is a long and active one, of inventiveness, of adaptability, of surprises, all balancings between strong tendencies; and, finally, all this harmonised into a complete whole in a way which might beforehand have seemed impossible. Here you have words opposed to things, speculation opposed to life in action. Take the different look that a system, philosophical or religious, wears, when we know it only by its name, and when we come to see what it is inside its own borders, and what it has to say for itself; and even if we condemn it, how different a shape our condemnation takes. Or again, take the way in which most of us think and speak of poverty, and wretchedness, and pain, and sin, in a wholesale sort of way, using the words like cyphers and counters, and compare that with the knowledge, various, strange, terrible, overpowering, of one who really goes in and out among the crowds, and knows them in their homes and haunts; and, further, with the idea which so much knowledge as this gives of the apparently infinite extent beyond, unknown, unfathomable, of misery, and suffering, and evil—all the varieties and families and complications of wickedness; all the forms of disease and wild anguish beyond which most of us think or dream—"*plurima mortis imago*"—moral and physical. And so, when we talk of the terrible things which the earth has seen, its wars and battles, its famines, its plagues, the gathering of all kinds of sickness in a great hospital; or again, some huge institution of customary wickedness and cruelty—the Roman games of the amphitheatre—the Inquisition of the Middle Ages—the slave trade of our own—what a difference, when we toss the mere words about, and when we make ourselves acquainted, seriously acquainted, with the very things that happened, with all their surroundings and consequences. There you have words, unreal, shadowy generalities, contrasted with things; the pale, vague aspects of things contrasted with the things themselves. Or, once more, contrast the idea beforehand of a life such as that of a university or a camp—I suppose it is the same with a life employed in great public affairs—with what it proves to be in actual result—the indistinct, childish, ignorant anticipations of the schoolboy, or the outsider, often so grotesque and so positive, with the real, manifold experience when it comes. That is the kind of difference between words and things; between untested words, unexplored, superficial notions, and a system actually at work in its various functions.

So with Christianity—with the religion which St. Paul called the "Kingdom of God." We may talk about it, for, indeed, it is impossible to keep it out of our conversation. But we may talk about it as an ordinary landsman talks about the management of a ship, or the qualities of seamanship; or, with the ideas of a fashionable trifler about the poverty of the poor; or, with those of a schoolboy about the work of a Cabinet. We may talk with a mere external thought of it, as an expression necessary in political, or philosophical, or social writing. We may not only talk but speculate about it, with interest and ingenuity; yet, with all our ingenuity and interest, deal with it as theologians and preachers sometimes unhappily deal with the great theories and conclusions of science in a way which scientific men justly resent as impertinent ignorance, knowing as they do how solid, and vast, and difficult a thing science is, how thorough in its processes, how firm in its grounds, how wide-reaching in its powers. Indeed, it is not every one who has a right to speak, even of what he most dislikes or distrusts, in science. But religion, too, is a deep and substantial thing—much more than a matter of words and superficial notions: and, it, too, must be *known*, if it is to be spoken of reasonably, and justly, and wisely, as all that greatly interests and affects mankind may expect to be spoken of.

For, indeed, Christianity is not speculation or anything speculative. The "Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power." It is not satisfied even with abstract truth. It must be life, or it is nothing. It has, of course it must have, a philosophy. But the moment it is treated merely as a philosophy the idea and meaning of it perishes in our hands. The "Kingdom of God," if it is the Kingdom of God, is a religion, a loyalty, a power, an influence, a service; conquering, quickening, stimulating, controlling man, his soul, his will, his character, his fate, and history. Independently of our thoughts about it, it is every day working its work among the consciences, the aspirations, the anxieties of thousands of men. While we are judging it, it is judging us. Whether we are for it or against it, whether it perplexes us, or attracts us, or irritates us, it goes on its course in a path beyond our reach, beyond our calculations. It has gone on for nineteen centuries. It is going on still—"not in word, but in power"—not as a theory, but as one of the elemental forces in the life which we know—perhaps as mysterious and inexplicable beyond a fixed point as they, but at least as much a fact.

A fact, obviously, in its outward aspect, as no one denies. It is taught, it is preached, it is professed, it governs. But it is for much more than because it manifests itself in public institutions, that the "Kingdom of God" is one of those things which are "not in word, but in power." It is not because it bears itself so loftily among the

things of men. It is not because its cross is on the crowns of kings and the banners of great nations. It is not because its claim is allowed on man's substance and man's time. It is not because it has educated generations in great schools and universities. It is not because it has moulded the worship of civilized men. It is not because it is enshrined in cathedrals, and has also hallowed God's Acre and God's House in the poorest hamlet of the obscurest corner of Christendom. All this may go—hard as it is to imagine it—as it has come: it was once; again, it may not be. Nor again, what is more, because when we look over the history of the greatest and most fruitful times of the human race we see what it has done. The footsteps of the Kingdom of God are among us. In that long line of chequered but undoubted progress since it made its home with men, in those struggles after better things, often so misplaced and futile but so obstinate and unrelaxed, which have marked the centuries since it came, we see the signs of what was not in the world before. We, men of the West, surely we are not mistaken in claiming, in a large view, our superiority over the quick-witted races of the East, over the great races which preceded us, and gave us so many of our most prized possessions; but a superiority, not surely in intellect, but in, what we call, character, in our wider and nobler and more manly view of the conditions and facts and government of life; and where did we learn this? The Kingdom of God has not been with us in vain. It has not been idle among us. At least it has left its monuments with us.

But there is more than this. It would be little if only its monuments were among us. "The Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power." It is in its hold, so tenacious and so eventful, on the inner life of men, that these words are verified. I venture to say that they are as true at this moment as they were when they were first written. I venture to say that there never has been a generation since they were first written, when they were not amply verified. There rises up, indeed, before our memory and imagination all the inconsistency, all the unfaithfulness, all the lethargy, all the consummate hypocrisy, all the abandoned wickedness in high and low, which has neutralised or perverted Christianity—the Kingdom of God. It is an awful, a portentous vision, in what it is, in what it threatens. But, beside it, is the no less certain truth, that in the worst and most fatal storm, the hopes of the Kingdom of God, its power over men, its spring of recovery have never been overwhelmed. How could they be? Man is so made, so "fearfully and wonderfully made," that the thrill which Christianity sent through him at first it sends through him still. Without a rival it has the key of his heart—his longing, wavering, suffering, doubting, suspicious heart. It has come, not only into the outward world of sight and speech, but into the invisible world of souls; and there it has set up its throne, and rules as nothing else does, except the passions which it combats. It has brought a new language into the world, the interpreter of the affections, the emotions, the ideas which it has opened to the human soul, a language not for the few, but for the many, a language which all understand who "travail and are heavy laden," who sin and who suffer, who weep and who die, who pray and who hope; a language which makes the things beyond time and the grave to be the common food of daily life, a language in which the men who have passed away ages ago communicate and sympathise with the men of to-day, and which is understood all over the world by races and classes which have nothing else in common. Now, as in the middle ages—now, as in the catacombs, or in the desert—now, as in the first days—the cry *Kyrie Eleison*, Lord, have mercy on us, goes up from the depth of men's souls. The love of the cross is their hope in extremity. The prayer to Our Father in the many languages of man, sums up their petitions and self-dedication. It has penetrated everywhere, where men feel most strongly, most tenderly, most really, where they think most seriously. It has sent its fibres so deeply into the structure of civilised life, into marriage, into education, into mourning, into the chamber of death and separation, that life, as we know it, is unintelligible without it. Every book that we open, of friend, or foe, or neutral, bears witness to its pervading and intangible power. The great prophets of human thought and human character, Shakespeare and Bacon, reflect in every page its ideas, speak perforce and naturally the language it has taught them, acknowledge and bow down before its presence, as they do before the law of right or wrong, as they do before the realities of joy, and pain and death. And its words and thoughts come as naturally to the souls of the humblest, in those hours which teach truth to men, and which make all men equal before the facts of life.

For it answers to three things in us, which, as long as men are what we know them, we never shall get rid of, and against which both speculation and passion beat in vain—the consciousness of evil and sin; the recognition of righteousness as our true law and standard; the longing for love. They are elements latent wherever you can trace the rudiments of a moral being, as we know moral beings; but the coming of the "Kingdom of God," in the person of Jesus Christ, has quickened and developed them as they never were before; and it is by its hold upon them, while we are discussing it, defining it, doubting it, that it rules in consciences and hearts, and creates a new and enduring life, which it is idle to deny, in the bitterest moment of hostility and despair. It rules in the tremendous and mysterious idea of sin, that idea so hard to analyse and to follow to its roots, but which is stamped on the face of

history and society, and which each man's self-knowledge is compelled to recognise. It rules in the idea of righteousness, of a reality of goodness, to which the eyes of even the worst can be opened; of a recovery from the delusions and the waste of evil; of endless hopes of moral elevation and improvement. It rules in the idea of holiness, in the idea of purity, in the idea of truth. They are ideas belonging to the essential furniture of the soul, not utterly lost even in its debasement and blindness. It rules in the idea of forgiveness and mercy. It rules in the inextinguishable idea of final judgment. And then it rules in the Person, and life, and death of Jesus Christ; of Him, Who, "though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we, through His poverty, might become rich."—"Who loved me, and gave Himself for me:"—while those words haunt the memories of men, the soul, after all its wanderings in search of something to trust to, of something to love, of something to love it, will find them waiting for it, will find that they are like nothing else in the world, that they are irresistible. "Not in word, but in power," have been the countless lives of charity and sacrifice, lives of every various order of obscurity and splendour, which have been lived in the faith of that Son of God, and have repeated on a humbler stage and in narrower spheres the lesson of the Cross of Christ.

It is one of the dangers of human life, amid its keen and varied interests, to lose sight of one or other of the standing and primary realities by which it is surrounded and which cannot be forgotten without loss or risk. The utilitarian forgets that there is such a thing as poetry and passion and the mere sense of what is beautiful. The practical man cannot think how so much time is spent on literary training or abstract speculation; the thinker, absorbed in a great philosophy, wonders at the fascination of politics or commerce. Yet all these things belong equally to the great facts of the world, whether we remember them or not; they don't depend on our observing them; they go on and work and tell upon the world; and it is we who are the losers, if we are too busy or too narrow or too blind to take account of them. And so, whether we forget it or no, whether we appreciate it or no, the Kingdom of God, the Gospel and the Church of Jesus Christ, with all their wonders, *exist:* exist, not in books or theories, but in fact—exist, "not in word, but in power"—exist, prior to all views and speculations about them—exist, really, and widely, and inexhaustibly, animating and governing human life—exist, after the long testing of time and experience, after the fiercest hostility, and the most merciless criticism—exist, after enduring everything that undermines and kills ideas and institutions—exist, as really, I do not say as worthily, but as really, as they did at first, in that which is their true seat the convictions and the affections of the souls of men.

If that which is best in us is not to be maimed and cramped, we have need to take full account of this as much as of the facts of nature and society. We shall be living, if we do not, in an imaginary and unreal world. We must meet the Kingdom of God. We find it here and we must meet it either as friend or foe; for it is a practical thing; and however much we may dispute, and, while we are disputing, men are born and are dying; men sin and suffer, and need but too deeply all that can be done for them. In this world, which is often in its reality so startling a contrast to what we assume in our speculations and imagine in our dreams, high practical truth many a time, even in the hurry and distractions of our rush through life, comes to us like the Sphinx; it requires an answer, and, alas for those who give the wrong one! But we must give an answer. In such a thing as the claims of the Kingdom of God we must make our choice and abide it. In all practical matters, in the domain of politics, in the conduct and critical turning-points of life there are things which cannot be open questions. No one has a right to expect that to those who believe at all in the Kingdom of God it should be, however questioned, to them an open question. They cannot look at it simply as a matter for argument. Their whole being must be revolutionised for them to contemplate steadily the possibility of the Kingdom of God turning out a mistake or an untruth. If we, who believe in it, are wrong, it is little what the consequences will be to ourselves; for our mistake will mean a final and fatal sentence passed on all that we know of human intelligence and, what is more, on the moral capacities of mankind. But it is not we only who must make the venture.

If, then, you find yourself dealing with the claims of the Kingdom of God and sitting in judgment upon them, recognise what you are questioning. Recognise that you are judging the greatest spiritual and moral force in the world. And, at least, take care that you know what Christianity is before you judge it. Take it all in, not partially or by suppositions; take it all in, all that such life and reality imply, such living power, living you know not how and reaching you know not whither, but certainly living and working; take it all in, and all that would not be, if all this were not. And if you don't know it and cannot know it, as only it can be known, own to yourself that you don't know it, and be as modest and careful as all men ought to be about what they don't know. Leave it alone, if you are not prepared to be serious; leave it alone, if you are not prepared for what such inquiry involves of steadiness, of time, of thoroughness, of sacrifice; leave it alone, if you are not prepared to deal with it as the great and tremendous reality that it is. It is not the love of being right which makes the love of truth; it is this desire to be right, planted in the heart of sincerity, of patience, of purity, of unselfishness,

of humility; in a character which shrinks from indolence and negligence, which shrinks from that blinding and deadly enemy of all truth, the habit of insolence and scorn.

But on us, to whom the Kingdom of God is no dream or supposition, but the most solid of certainties, who could not, if we would, shake off the conviction and the consciousness of its existence and power, what a responsibility rests! Christianity, it is said everywhere, is not a thesis, or a system, or a school of thought, but a life answering to great certainties around us and without us. What a responsibility for being as good as our word, in sincerity, in courage, in loyalty to our King! What a note it will be against our generation if it ever shall be said that it was one in which Christians had not the moral fibre to understand and value all that they had in Christianity, and can hope for nowhere else—in which, with all that they knew, with all their experiences, they had not the courage to face the difficulties of choice, which are the common difficulties of all men—in which they gave it up, with all its powers for righteousness and all its hopes for man, cowering before the ominous aspects and prophecies of the hour. Ours is really no new and strange trial, though it seems so to us: in every age the faith and patience of the saints have had to endure the perpetual contrast between things seen and things not seen. It was this contrast which made St. John write, "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." It was this contrast which drew that burst from St. Paul, alone, against the thought and opinion of the world of his time, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." May we not, loaded as we are by God's gifts, "enriched in all utterance and all knowledge," be weak and poor followers of such great examples! "O Lord, in Thee have I trusted; let me never be confounded."

DEATH.

By the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., Curate of Penwortham, Preston.

Sermon Preached at Penwortham.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return to God who gave it."—Ecclesiastes xii. 7.

WE have in this twelfth chapter of the Book of Ecclesiastes the most poetic description of death to be found in the whole Bible. No one can fail to be struck with the beauty of the imagery in which the thought is clothed: we feel the impressiveness of almost every sentence, yet for all that—perhaps indeed because of that—we also feel that the weary tone of the whole Book here sinks down into profound sadness. We feel that the beauty of the language in which the thought is clothed, its stately and solemn rhythm, cannot disguise the mournfulness—the almost utter despair—with which the writer evidently regards death. He ends his description with the same sweeping generalization with which his Book began—"Vanity of vanities, all is vanity"—and he can find for his readers, solemnized by the subject, no other consolation than the precept: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man;"—a consolation, surely, if indeed it is intended for consolation, which to the weary and worn out, to the sad and sorrowing, to those oppressed with the feeling of failure and borne down by the sense of sin, must have been one of the bitterest irony. In fact the preacher (whether Jewish or Alexandrian) has really nothing new to say; he can sum up his discourse with a forcible precept, but cannot shew us how to obey it; he can clothe his one idea in poetic imagery, but stripped of the surroundings, it only comes to a statement that man is mortal. A statement common-placed enough! A truth that we all know—one which will furnish no matter for ordinary conversation, and one from which we are ready enough to turn, like the oft-quoted Justice Shallow, to our "yoke of oxen," our trade, our amusement, or something at any rate newer and more congenial.

Yes! the statement that "man is mortal," that "we must all die," is too common-placed for conversation; but it is no common-place in trouble, in sorrow, in hours of solitary thought during summer's twilight or winter's long, lighted evenings, or whensoever we may be passing through one of those rare moments of experience when we *feel* the truth of a common-place, which is as different from what we *call* knowing it as the vision of waters upon the earth is different from the vision in delirium of water which cannot be had to cool the burning tongue.

"*We* must die" may be common-placed, but who will dare to say that of "*I* must die, and perhaps soon"? For when we realise that, then death grapples us; then we seem to stand on the brink of the dark river, and to hear the splash of the oncoming oar. "*I* must die" is no common-place; truism must not blind us to truth: we have known what it is to lose some one near and dear, there will come a time when some circle will sorrow for us. We have listened in sadness to the last solemn words, "Man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of misery; he cometh up and is cut down like a flower; he fleeth as it were like a shadow, and never continueth in one stay"—have seen the coffin lowered into the grave, and have heard the dull thud of the damp earth falling thereon while the words are repeated, "Earth to earth, dust to dust, ashes to ashes"; how long will it be ere the same solemn service is said over us? We have felt

what it is to return to the dreary round of daily duties, to interests which then seem so hollow, and hopes which then seem so transient, with the dull ache of a void which cannot be filled in our hearts; some day a group of mourners will return from our grave, there will be new plans which we shall not share, a void which we have caused.

At times like these even "we must die" is no common-place; even the most talkative are silenced then, and the boldest forget to jest. But indeed it is never a mark of true courage to speak lightly of death; no sensible man will speak triflingly even of the mere physical phenomena of death—of the separation, that is, of soul from body. For we can none of us even guess what the sensation of dying is like; it is mockery therefore for a man to make light of what he is ignorant of: true thoughtfulness must shrink from death, and much of the bravado with which death is spoken of arises only from a want of courage to resist a bad custom; men may talk bravely of death, but that does not prevent them shrinking from it in their inmost hearts. We naturally shrink from death when we are overwhelmed with the sense of our own littleness and insignificance—of our absolute unimportance in the universe and in humanity. How insignificant we feel ourselves by the side of the comparatively enduring works of nature! How little would any one of us be missed amongst the hundreds of millions who inhabit this globe! How short is the longest life by the side of the ages and ages during which the heavenly bodies have kept their appointed course! How lonely the beauty of nature makes us feel when at sunset on some calm afternoon in winter, or summer's evening, we stand looking over some wide-spread landscape, watching nature's varied lights and colours gradually fading away!

The mere sense of beauty fading away attunes our minds to thoughts of a more solemn strain. There, around us, is the busy world, thinking nothing of us, caring nothing for us. We may never again stand where now we stand, with the fields and trees melting away in a distant haze, but what does nature care? We may be in our graves before the varied colours of summer change to the leaden gloom of winter; will it be either more or less so for *that*? Next spring the flowers will blossom, and the birds sing, whether we are there to see and hear them or not; man will go forth to his work and to his labour daily, as busy then as now, knowing and thinking of us as little, nay less; and then, when the failing light becomes dimmer, and the scene around us is wrapt in its cloak of darkness, we begin to realise what it is to be alone, and there comes a stir in our heart like pain, and something like an unspoken cry, for we feel, like Jacob, "Surely God is in this place, and I knew it not." Yet all this is nothing when placed by the side of the loneliness of death. We die alone. We go on our dark mysterious journey for the first time without one to accompany us. Friends are beside our bed, they must stay behind, helpless. Into God's awful presence we must go—alone.

And even yet this is not all; it is not the sense of loneliness that makes us most shrink from death. The sting of death, St. Paul says, is sin. There is something that appals in death when there are distinct separate acts of guilt resting on the memory, and the feeling of a guilty heart makes it an awful thing to die. A man has injured some one, he has made money, or got on by unfair means, he has been unchaste, he has done some one of those thousand things which leave upon the heart the dark spot that will not come out.

All these are sins which can be counted up and numbered, and the recollection of them is that agony which we call remorse. Many have remembrances of this kind which are fatal to serenity; men try to shut them out, but it will not do, for they bide their time and suddenly thrust themselves forward together with the thought of a judgment seat.

And besides special acts of sin there is the sting of sinfulness, the wretched consciousness of an unclean heart, the feeling that though *man* may bring no charge against us, yet our heart does—*that* is not clean. It is not so much what we have done as what we are, it is the feeling "who shall save me from myself." Oh, it is a desolate thing to think of the coffin when that thought weighs with all its misery upon the soul—*that* is the sting of death.

And if for us there were no other consolation than such as the Book of Ecclesiastes supplies; if poetic language were our only solace, and a precept too hard for weak human nature to fully carry out our only spur; then we too, in the presence of daily increasing knowledge and of almost hourly advancing science, which enlarge our views of life and of nature, but do not extend our appointed time for investigating them, could only agree with the wearied-out statement, "of the making of many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness to the flesh," and echo the dull, cynical summary, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity."

But there is a brighter side. The pre-Christian, even the Jewish, view of death is no longer the true one. Christ has risen. He has conquered death and the grave, poetry therefore may now be stripped away from death to give place to reality. He has brought life and immortality to light, has robbed the grave of its terrors, and has shown death to be only the portal from time to eternity. Now is Christ risen, and has become the first-fruits of them that sleep, therefore we sorrow not for our lost ones as those who have no hope; for we believe that Jesus died and rose again, therefore them that sleep in Jesus shall God bring with Him. The author of the Book of Ecclesiastes

can hardly hide his gloom and depression when writing of death; St. Paul, on the contrary, writing to the Corinthians on the same subject, rises to a strain of joy and triumph. "As in Adam all die," he writes, "so in Christ shall all be made alive. Behold, I show you a mystery! We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?"

And mark how he sums up. St. Paul can do more than lay down a hard and fast precept, "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man;" he can show us from whom the requisite power to keep it is to be obtained. "Therefore, my beloved brethren," he goes on, "be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labour is not in vain *in the Lord*." It is these words "in the Lord" that have changed morality into enthusiasm, they make all the difference. It is the magic words "in Christ" that have robbed death of its sting and the grave of its victory—that have taught us both how to live and how to die, and have turned existence into life. "He," says St. John, "that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life." And again St. Paul says, "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."

For the magic words "in Christ" have not only changed our view of death, they have also raised our conception of life. Christ's command, "take up thy cross daily and follow me," and the Apostolic charge, "if then ye be risen with Christ seek those things that are above," leave no room for a "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity,"—the precept, "fear God and keep his commandments," has been extended to "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

There may, and indeed must, still be the natural shrinking from dissolution, the form* of the angel of death will still present the skeleton's cold aspect on our side, however white and radiant its glow on the heavenward side; but if only we make St. Paul's words our own, "Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God," we can look steadily onward to that city which hath the foundations—to our true home, where Christ hath gone before to prepare a place for us. Death's sting may still be sharp, but "in Christ," "forgetting those things that are behind"—our sins, our sorrows, our struggles, our failures—we may "press on to the mark of the prize of our high calling in Christ Jesus," and looking ever upward and Godward may begin our hymn of triumph *now*, for victory is pledged; "thanks be to God, who," not *shall* give, but "*giveth* us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

* I have taken this idea from Sir Noel Paton's noble picture "Mors Janua Vitæ," and in a preceding paragraph I have ventured to borrow one or two expressions from the late F. W. Robertson's striking sermon on the same subject.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1881.

LOVE OF TRUTH.

THERE can be very little doubt of the fact that in the present day a great deal of indulgence is demanded and conceded for freedom of thought on the ground of love of truth. So much indeed is this the case that the question naturally arises, Is there not even an abuse of what to a certain extent is so great a good? To hear some persons speak, it would seem that the search for truth was "the be-all and the end-all;" while its possession was comparatively unimportant. Another differs from us on some point, which we consider of vital importance; he claims to love and seek truth as diligently as we; Ought not that, he says, to be enough for us? What higher claim can we advance for the possession of our theory? Such a plea is often confidently put forward as sufficient; a little reflection will show it is not so. As a general principle, the mere desire for truth does not necessarily of itself enable us to find it; the desire no doubt is most valuable, but it is not all. Take an illustration. We are at sea in a storm; one of the passengers attempts to toss the compass overboard and take charge of the helm. We remonstrate, and do more, for we take effectual measures to prevent him from carrying out his plans. He indignantly says, "Am not I as desirous as you that the ship should reach the haven? I have long thought over the subject, and am fully persuaded that my way of effecting this is the best; your compass is a piece of antiquated lumber; get rid of it, and trust yourselves to my more easy and safe plan." "Pardon us," we reply; "an equal desire on your part to save yourself and us does not necessarily qualify you to do so; love of truth here is not enough. The possession of it and power to apply its lessons are absolutely necessary. In this case, moreover, knowledge of the truth means knowledge of navigation; we cannot dispense with tried and known results in favour of your self-asserted superior knowledge." Let us therefore bear this in mind, that the search for truth and its possession are not equivalent. The tendency of some in the present day is to assert that whatever

a person finds after honest search is practically truth. But there is surely some definite absolute truth in every domain—in theology, in mental, moral, and physical sciences; and persons who arrive at opposite conclusions in these cannot all be equally right. Even in the search for truth how much depends on other qualifications than mere love of truth; how much on an acute and powerful mind; how much on industry; how much on a teachable spirit; on patience, &c.? It is not enough therefore to plead love of truth as a justification for every extreme and extravagant opinion, and to weep before high heaven at the bigotry of those who refuse to admit the plea as a sufficient ground for a "new departure" in religion, in morals, or in politics. And here we would ask our readers to consider the following thoughtful passage bearing on the subject, from the pen of one whose words deserve to be "chewed and digested." It may present the matter to some of them in a new light, the analogy made use of being very striking:—

"That the Unitarians of this country can be putting forward such an infidel mind as Blanco White's as an exemplar at all is a striking fact. They cannot profess actually to agree with him; they do not professedly reject the Bible. Blanco White is very far in advance even of them; he positively laments over their prejudiced and superstitious creed as compared with his own. Then why do they put him forward? Because he is a martyr to truth; because he pursues his own ideas of truth fearlessly in spite of all difficulties. This standard gives a wide field of sympathy, and as if truth itself were nothing, and the search after it the only reality, that process of restlessness and difficulty which any inquirer, be he what he may, goes through, is made an ultimate virtue. Superseding all other considerations whatever, the simple exertion of the intellectual powers is beatified and glorified as such, and canonizes the man. We are unable to see for our part on what such a view as this, when pushed to its legitimate basis, can rest, but the assertion of this principle, viz., that the intellectual part of human nature is no department of human probation. Every one allows that man is tempted, and is capable of sinning through the flesh; but it seems there are some who deny that he is capable of sinning through the intellect. They see in all its movements pure rational influence at work. We believe that the intellect is capable of sin as really as the flesh is. We say it in no spirit of caricature, that state of misery, doubt, and inquietude which a certain intellectual course brings on, does not in itself prove any more moral a martyrdom than the martyrdom of emaciation and disease that accompanies a licentious life. If the intellect can sin, its excesses must produce mental misery as the natural consequences of a violated nature and the use of a morbid internal stimulus. Infidelity points to a ghastly and sepulchral crown, to a career of doubt, hollowness, and restlessness as an heroic life, as so much pain gone through in the great cause of truth. It compares such a course with the calm course of faith; as if it were comparing activity with torpor, and sensibility with indifference."—(Extract from Professor Mozley's "Essay on Blanco White.")

This may be quite true if the intellect is sinless. If it is not, then let such thinkers take care that they are not comparing disease with health, and attenuation with vigour; then let them be sure that they are not exposing themselves to another view of the case. True, the sceptical intellect has its crown and has its martyrdom: it is the enemy of health and strength; it emaciates, it unnerves, it unstrings; it destroys the soul's balance; its serpentine stimulus, like the fiery liquors, become the more necessary the more it is taken, and it leaves the soul dry and anatomised. This is a martyrdom in a sense, and who would pray for it?

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I think a careful perusal of my letter, page 291, will show that it is not fairly open to all the strictures which the Rev. T. G. Bonney makes upon it. However, my object is not to justify myself, and I must not think of troubling him further. I had hoped that he, being learned in zoology, palæontology, stratigraphy, &c., and in the Scriptures, would have stated briefly and *plainly* what he understands when he repeats in the Fourth Commandment the clause, "For in *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and *rested* the seventh day," in order that we less learned people might be able to explain it to ordinary hearers so as not to contradict any truth of religion or science.

I conclude from his letters that by that clause he understands is meant, either that God made all in a period of time, designated six days, denoting six "picturesque verbal diagrams," and that by God's *resting* the seventh day he understands a diminished rate of evolution; or else that when God said "For in six days," He was merely utilising a current opinion of the day, without meaning to imply such opinion to be true, using it only to enforce on the Children of Israel their resting on the Sabbath day.

I thank him for his letters, and would be glad if "C. P. R." or others who have thought of the subject would say whether they think the above are the best explanations we can at present give of the passage alluded to.

I am sorry to say that I have not an opportunity of seeing the books your correspondents kindly refer to, nor time to *study* geology; but believe your paper will become increasingly useful if learned and scientific divines, bearing with our smaller amount of knowledge, will help us to furnish sound answers to difficulties which attract attention in some minds.

Would "Broadchurch" say where in Robertson's "Life and Letters," second edition, 2 vols., is the letter he refers to? I unfortunately have not lighted on it, looking over the edition I have.

RICHARD GALBRAITH.

The Secretary of the Church Association has published the following statement:—"The balance of costs due in the suits instituted against the Rev. T. Pelham Dale, late rector of St. Vedast, have lately been paid by Messrs. Brooks and Co., and the sequestration on his landed property has now been removed. The statements that Mr. Dale had no property, which were so industriously circulated, are now shown to be without foundation, the fact being that Mr. Dale had a considerable landed estate in the county of Kent. The case is now brought to an end."

THE ART OF SPEAKING AND READING.

By the Rev. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.,
Vicar of Brigstock.

(Continued from page 191.)

There is no principle of elocution more important in every way than that of word-grouping. We have found it necessary to make a similar remark about other principles that underlie the art. It would appear, then, that the principles are all important. This is true: only that the one under treatment presents its useful aspects more immediately and presses them more effectively upon our acceptance for the time being. When we think of the whole and dispassionately weigh the relative value of each, it is difficult to say which plays the most important part. The better plan is to give each all the attention possible. We may, however, very safely say of the principle of word-grouping —Too much cannot easily be made of it. The effect of its application is always and at once perceptible.

We have explained to some extent what the principle of *word-grouping* is, and have also shown its *rationale.* Our object at present will be to learn how to apply it.

The first thing to do is to dispense with the stops. "Fling away ambition" was Wolsey's advice to Cromwell. Our first advice to our readers is—"Fling away the stops." This advice will be more than a matter of surprise. It will almost stagger some who read it. Yet, with a perfect knowledge of what we say, we give it calmly and dispassionately. We must explain a little. Stops have served their purpose very well. When we were children, we were duly taught their respective use. "Count one when you come to a comma, two when you come to a semicolon, &c., &c." All this we have been very careful to do. We were good children. But we are children no longer. We are men, and put away childish things. We must now use stops only for the purpose for which they were designed. Stops are the writer's tools: they are not the speaker's. The writer uses them to enable him to make his meaning clear. They are, in short, grammatical points. To regard them in any other light is to misuse them. The speaker's object is to convey a meaning which he has clearly apprehended in a way very different from that of the writer. He uses stops to apprehend, not to convey, the meaning of what is written. It is the province of the principle of word-grouping to aid the speaker in making clear to others what is clear in his own mind. The process is not complicated at all. It is simple. It involves, it is true, a little labour. By the stops he ascertains the sense of a writer; by the principle of word-grouping he conveys it. If he is but speaking his own thoughts the process is simply reduced to that of being clear and expressing clearly. And here, too, the principle will operate.

The application of the principle is somewhat arbitrary. This arises from its nature. "Many men have many minds." This is nowhere, perhaps, more evident than in the working out of this principle. Here the truth of the maxim appears very clearly. There is no reason against it. Men see differently, and so their apprehension of things is not always identical. The result, however, will be very similar in every case. The application of the principle, though indifferent, will be much more satisfactory than its absence.

It has been suggested to the writer that it would be a useful work, and most helpful to the clergy generally, to take the whole Prayer-book and parts of the Bible and group them off by practically applying the principle of word-grouping. But this would be directly opposed to our view of elocution as an art. We conceive that the art involves principles rather than rules. Principles are much wider and deeper in their application than rules. Principles make men: rules make monkeys. Query—Is this not equally so in the realm of morals? But to proceed. If principles, and not rules, constitute and enter exclusively into the art of reading and speaking, they must be allowed to work for themselves in the person who is under their influence. This is obvious. Our object is simplified. We have only to name, describe, and explain the application of these principles. We have done this with word-grouping. We ought now to leave it to operate of itself. It is, however, not always easy to make things clear by writing, so it may not be inadvisable to illustrate the way in which the principle may be employed. We will apply it to the exhortation in the Prayer-book :—

"Dearly beloved brethren—the Scripture moveth us—in sundry places—to acknowledge—and confess—our manifold sins—and wickedness—and that we—should not dissemble—nor cloke them—before the face—of Almighty God—our heavenly Father—but confess them—with an humble—lowly—penitent—and obedient heart—to the end—that we may obtain—forgiveness—of the same—by His infinite goodness —and mercy—And—although—we ought—at all times —humbly to acknowledge—our sins—before God—yet ought we—most chiefly—so to do—when we assemble —and meet together—to render thanks—for the great benefits—that we have received—at His hands—to set forth—His most worthy praise—to hear—His most holy Word—and to ask—those things—which are requisite—and necessary—as well for the body—as the soul—Wherefore—I pray—and beseech you—as many as—are here present—to accompany me—with a pure heart—and humble voice—unto the throne—of the heavenly grace—saying after me."

An examination of the way in which we have applied the principle in this particular case will serve to illustrate what we have said above—the application of it is to a very great extent arbitrary. Another reader, seeing differently, would not group off the words in exactly the same way. It will also further appear that the result, as we have said, will not in every case, notwithstanding, be very different. The effect at all times will be better than a neglect to recognise that there is such a principle as this of which we are treating.

Now, we would strongly counsel all our readers to proceed at once to make use of this principle. Never read a single passage in public without actually applying it after the manner indicated above. It means, as is obvious, a great deal of labour, and this for a long time. It does not mean labour for ever. When the principle is well fixed in the mind, it will operate of itself. It means labour, but not labour that will receive no reward. None of us, we presume, like to discharge our duties inefficiently. On the contrary, most of us are actuated with a desire to do good work. Here, then, we have a principle, which if well applied, will help to make all the difference. In a future paper, if all be well, we shall endeavour to show how the beauties, characteristic of much that is written, will, on the application of this principle, characterise all that is read. Meantime we send forth our advice with an expressed wish that it may accomplish its fullest aim.

(To be continued.)

LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL.—MEMORIAL OF MRS. BICKERSTETH.

The North Transept doorway of Lichfield Cathedral, immediately opposite the Deanery, has within the last three months been restored by contributions of some ladies of the Close and neighbourhood of Lichfield. This doorway is of about the date A.D. 1240, and is of a highly ornamental character. The position of the Cathedral, upon the side of a slope falling rapidly from North to South, has rendered necessary a flight of steps externally downwards from what is known as the "Dean's Walk" to the North door, and again another flight internally until the level floor of the Cathedral is reached. The North doorway itself is enclosed by a richly-sculptured arch, the opening for the door being intersected by a single-clustered shaft with capital, from which spring arches, so as to form a double door. In the space between the two arches thus formed is a niche about three feet in height, containing till recently a figure in Roman cement, which is supposed to have replaced a figure of St. Anne, the mother of the Virgin. Beyond the double-arched doorway proper are five mouldings, or orders, of an architrave of very rich character. Of these, the first immediately beyond the doorway arch contains a series of beautifully-sculptured little figures, in ovals or "vesicas," representing probably the choirs of Angels, nine on each side. The next order of the architrave beyond this moulding is ornamented by bosses of a very bold character, formed apparently of the large dog-tooth, overlaid with foliage. The third order or moulding from the centre is again filled with "vesicas," containing figures which may be supposed to represent Patriarchs and Prophets. This is followed by an order containing ornamental foliage. Then comes the outer order of all, the fifth from the doorway arch. This order contains manifestly, on the left or Eastern side, the genealogy of our Blessed Lord, beginning with Jesse, and ending with the Virgin and Child, close to the crown of the arch. On the right or Western side, at the foot, opposite to the figure of Jesse, is a figure supposed to be that of St. Chad, in the act of baptising the sons of Wulfhere. Above St. Chad come the Apostles, in the conventional order as given in Mrs. Jameson's very suggestive work on "Sacred and Legendary Art" (Vol I., p. 175), beginning with St. Matthias and ending with St. Peter at the top, close to the crown of the arch on the Western side, and in juxtaposition to the Virgin and Child. Next below St. Peter comes St. Paul. This splendid architrave is surmounted by a weather moulding forming a gable to the whole. In the space between the crown of the architrave and the head of this gable there was originally some rich sculpture in bas-relief, representing probably our Lord in glory, with two beautifully-proportioned kneeling figures of angels, one on either side, in the act of censing. It will be seen at once from this description that the whole subject of the illustrations in carved stone of this doorway is a really grand conception. But this beautiful monument of thirteenth-century sacred art has suffered not only from the wear of time, but also from fanatical zeal, and, after that, from injudicious restoration. To begin with, the true proportions of the doorway had been spoilt by burying the lower portions of the arch in soil, with the view apparently of obtaining an easier access to the Cathedral. Then the Roman cement—that *bête noire* of Cathedral and other restorations at the beginning of the present century—had been freely applied to this doorway. The original figure of St. Anne, probably dislodged at the time of the siege of Lichfield Close, had been replaced about the end of the last century by a Roman-cement figure of very commonplace design; while the greater part of the ornamental sculpture in the head of the gable had been superseded by a square block of this stucco, on which was moulded in relief a bust of our Saviour, altogether out of keeping with the surrounding sculpture. Upon the removal of this ugly block of cement there was discovered behind it the mould of the original work, consisting of a large oval or "vesica," which at once suggested the form that the restored work should take. Accordingly, to Mr. Bridgeman (who has done such good service to the Cathedral already as a sculptor) was entrusted the work of designing and executing a figure of our Lord in glory. This delicate undertaking has been admirably performed; and there is now a beautifully-executed figure of our Lord, in bas-relief, placed in a vesica of precisely the same dimensions as the original, while the little censing angels on either side had happily survived the efforts of both destroyers and restorers, so far as to make their actual reproduction a work of comparative ease. The little figure in Roman cement of St. Anne has also been replaced by a singularly graceful little statue, designed and executed by Mr. W. R. Ingram, of 2, Eccleston Street, Buckingham Palace Road. This figure, while intended to be an ideal representation of St. Anne, presents also a likeness, easily recognised by those who knew her, of the late Mrs. Bickersteth, the wife of the Dean. At the base of the figure is the inscription:—

M.S.—NOTAS MIHI FECISTI VIAS VITÆ.
M. M. A. B., FEBRUARY 2, 1881.

A few of the voussoirs, where the sculpture had entirely disappeared and the stone had perished, have been most carefully renewed, under the direction of Mr. J. O. Scott, by Mr. Bridgeman. These restored stones are chiefly in the outer order of the architrave, which contains representations of the genealogy of our Lord and of the Apostles. In restoring these, great care has been taken to find out as accurately as possible which personage in the genealogy, or which Apostle would naturally occupy the space that had been left vacant by the wear of time and the decay of the stone. It should be added that the outer gable has been surmounted by an ornamented cross, of good thirteenth-century character. The gable has also been furnished at its base on either side with suitable finials of the same period.

The whole of this excellent restoration is designed as a memorial to the greatly loved and respected Mrs. Bickersteth. Mrs. Pole Shawe and Mrs. Babington having kindly collected contributions for this purpose, readily given by a large number of ladies of the Close, the City, and the neighbourhood.—*Staffordshire Advertiser.*

A society has been established at Exeter, under the patronage of the Bishop, to promote good manners. The members are to give the following undertaking:—"I promise, by God's help, to avoid cursing and swearing and all evil speaking, to bear no grudges, and to discountenance the same in others, to obey all lawful authority, to honour the Queen, to study to do good to all men, and to show kindness to animals."

Reviews and Notices.

"ECCLESIASTES," with Notes and Introduction. By E. H. Plumptre, D.D. Cambridge: University Press. 1881. Pp. 268.

If we were to characterise this interesting volume in a single phrase, we should describe it as criticism touched by poetry. To get at the real human heart of the writer of the Book which has been called "the sphinx of Hebrew literature," and to trace the ebb and flow of his thought through the discordant utterances which rebound from Epicurianism to Pessimism, from Pessimism to Cynicism, and from Cynicism to a reverent submission to the Almighty Judge—this has been Dr. Plumptre's aim; and this is not to be accomplished by a mere handling of the dry bones of philology and grammar, but by bringing to bear on the text that which is emphatically the poet's theme, the experience of living men, the play of desire and passion, of hope and despair, of which the human breast is the theatre. It is true that Ecclesiastes has obscure words and phrases which from time to time draw heavily on the expositor's scholarship and ingenuity; but these are but an insignificant part of the problem to be solved. The main question is, What are we to make of the Book as a whole? And that may be broken up into several questions, all linked together, the solution of which, if attainable, cannot fail to throw an important light on the Divine methods of teaching mankind. Out of what frame of mind did the Book spring, and what personal history lies beneath it? How are its sensual, sceptical, cynical utterances to be reconciled with the idea of its being in any sense inspired? How did such a Book ever gain admission into the Canon of Scripture? In what way may it be used for edification? No doubt the Book has had a strange fascination for the sated voluptuary, the cynical sceptic, and the votary of an ascetic mysticism; but what does it say for the enlightened, sober Christian of our day?

It is in the endeavour to settle this great question about the Book as a whole that Dr. Plumptre has put forth his strength, and drawn upon his extensive knowledge of literature. The most notable features of his treatment are to be found in the introduction and the appendix. In the one he has sketched an ideal biography of the supposed writer, taking him through scenes and experiences which in retrospect may have suggested the various reflexions embodied in the production of his premature and saddened old age; in the other he has copiously illustrated the phases of thought and feeling from the writings of Shakespeare, Tennyson, and a twelfth-century Persian poet, Omar Khayyam by name. Besides these illustrations, others are gathered from various sources, especially from the Greek tragedians, the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers, the German Pessimists, and poor Heinrich Heine. The ancient Preacher's (or rather *Debater's*) thoughts and feelings are thus woven in with the various and conflicting speculations and moods of the thinkers of all ages, who have perplexed themselves over the problem of human life. The scheme of interpretation thus constructed may be gathered from the following outline.

The date of the Book is placed between the limits 250—181 B.C., probably nearer the end than the beginning of this period. The consequence, that the author is not really Solomon, but only *personates* him, is quite in accordance with the literary customs of the time, and is no bar to the inclusion of the work in the Canon. The internal evidence which points to this date is found in the use of late words and idioms, in the style of the allusions to Solomon, in the references to Persian history, in the presence of the germs of Pharisaism, Sadduceeism, and the asceticism of the Essenes, in the echo of the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers, and generally in the saturation of the Book with Greek thought and language. The writer may have been born in Palestine about B.C. 230, the only son of some wealthy landowner, on whose estate he grew up to manhood, receiving an education in the synagogue, and sharing in the labours of the cornfield and vineyard. It was a time of deadness in religion, and the quick-witted lad seems to have detected and been revolted by the hypocrisy and self-seeking of the religionists who frequented his father's house. Arrived at manhood, he left his home and settled down at Alexandria. There he became a courtier and a sensualist; and when the Nemesis of profligacy came, in utter weariness and satiety he turned to the literature and philosophy of Greece as taught in the famous schools of Alexandria, and sought repose in the moderation and careless geniality enjoined by Epicurus. Elected to the Museum, and taking a share in its debates, a sceptical cynicism gradually took possession of his mind, and deepened into a bitter despair as he sank into premature exhaustion and decay. But in the struggle and the darkness conscience awoke, something of the old faith came back to him, and he was found of God. At last, in bitter self-condemnation, and in a submission dimly enlightened by a feeble hope, he put his experience on record in the Book which survives, and which originally ended with the solemn words (xii. 7): "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it"

This book, Dr. Plumptre imagines, was shortly afterwards found by the son of Sirach, who brought it to Palestine, where the last seven verses were added as a sort of commendatory epilogue, and it was after some debate admitted into the Canon. He adds that the mere fact of the hesitating acceptance of it at so late a time as the century preceding Christ is of itself almost decisive against the Solomonic authorship ascribed to it by tradition; for it is scarcely conceivable that the schools of Hillel and Shammai should at that time have been debating the canonicity of "a book that had come down from a remote antiquity with the prestige of Solomonic authorship, and had all along been held in honour as the representative of his divinely inspired wisdom."

Such is the explanation of "Ecclesiastes" which Dr. Plumptre puts before us. It is worked out in a very interesting and ingenious manner, and deserves attentive consideration from all who desire to obtain a critical appreciation of Holy Scripture. For the result, if in any substantial measure correct, throws a strong light on the latitude and variety of that inspiration which in a greater or less degree characterises all the sacred Canonical books. When we see among the ancient oracles of God a book abounding in sentiments opposed to the very elements of Christian faith, and thoroughly Pagan and sceptical in their character, and are compelled to admit that even this was used by the Divine Spirit and made to contribute towards the gradual instruction of mankind in the ways of God, we can no longer stumble at the employment, in other parts of the Bible, of current beliefs, traditions, and conceptions which are not true

in themselves, for purposes of discipline and edification. To strain out these with fastidious delicacy, while we swallow whole the book of the Preacher, would be to out-Pharisee the Pharisees. What is urgently needed is to break loose from artificial theories about the Bible, and to look honestly and fairly at what it contains; so shall we be delivered from disingenuous perversions of its meaning, and shall advance in our knowledge of God's methods of teaching and training us.

Before we conclude, we should like to call the attention of the author (whom we heartily congratulate on his well-earned promotion to be Dean of Wells), to an oversight which we have noticed in the introduction. Speaking of the preacher's anxiety about his burial, he says, "The patriotic zeal which had been roused by the struggle of the Maccabees against Antiochus Epiphanes, would not have allowed the body of one who was suspected of apostasy to desecrate the holy city." As the book has been already assigned to a date earlier than B.C. 180, which is more than ten years prior to the commencement of the Maccabean wars, it is obviously an anachronism to suppose the state of things succeeding those wars to have been present to the exile's mind, as a reason for his despair of being laid in the sepulchre of his fathers.

The Bishop of Norwich has closed the parish church of Blythburg, on account of the dangerous condition of its fine hammer-beam roof.

Mr. John W. Warman, A.C.O., writes from Canterbury that he has succeeded in starting an honorary company of bell-ringers for the Cathedral. "The Præcentor, one of the Minor Canons (president), one of the local clergy, the pastor of the French church, and others are members; and, as the changes are all composed under musical laws, we have some really delightful ringing."

A correspondent writes :—"The valuable living of Chieveley, near Newbury, is now vacant, having been resigned, through age, and for other causes, by the Rev. J. Ellill Robinson, who has held it for nearly forty-five years, and it is remarkable that his predecessor having been the vicar for forty-eight years, the living has been occupied by only two incumbents for the space of ninety-three years. The living is in the gift of the Rev. James David, now rector of Chevington, near Newcastle-on-Tyne, who intends entering upon the vicarage of Chieveley himself, and will enter upon his duties on January the 1st."

Twenty-four diocesan conferences have now had the matter of the Central Council formally put before them, and several long and anxious discussions have taken place thereon. The result is as follows :—Nineteen conferences have, by large majorities, and in several cases unanimously, agreed to send representatives—namely, Winchester, Bangor, Chichester, Ely, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Norwich, Oxford, Peterborough, Rochester, St. Albans, St. Asaph, Truro, Ripon, Chester, Carlisle, Manchester, Sodor and Man. Only one (Bath and Wells) has suggested another plan. Committees of Canterbury, Gloucester and Bristol, Salisbury, Liverpool, have been appointed to consider and report on the subject. Exeter, St. David's, York, and Durham have not had the matter yet brought before them. London, Worcester, and Llandaff have no diocesan conferences at present; but a scheme for one in London is under consideration.

On Monday last, the Bishop of Rochester consecrated the Church of the Good Shepherd, which has been erected in Handen Road, Lee, at the sole expense of Lord Northbrook, the lord of the manor. The church, which is very commodious, and built of red brick, with tiled roof and bell tower, has 650 seats, all free. There is no fixed incumbent, and the services will be conducted by the clergy of the mother church of St. Margaret, Lee, the Rev. F. H. Law, rector, and the Revs. W. A. Bramald, R. P. Willock, and C. D. Farrar, curates. The cost of the altar furniture and seats was defrayed by a special offertory of £556, recently collected at St. Margaret's; and the organ is the gift of Mr., Mrs., and Miss Barnes-Williams. In his sermon, Bishop Thorold referred to the generosity of Lord Northbrook, who had not only built that church, but had given the site of the neighbouring church of St. Mildred, Burnt Ash, South Lee, opened a short time since. He hoped his lordship's example would be followed by others in the neighbourhood. The English Church for two hundred years never had such deadly foes as she has now, but never had her organisation been more complete.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Carr, Rev. James Haslewood, rector of Adisham, near Canterbury.
Clarke, Rev. William Murray Charles, vicar of St. Michael, Tenterden.
Fox, Rev. W., rector of Stanton-by-Dale and Dale Abbey; rural Dean of Ockbrook.
Gleadowe, Rev. R. W., vicar of Neston; honorary canon of Chester Cathedral.
Mansel-Pleydell, Rev. J. C. M., curate of St. Mary Abbots, Kensington; rector of Bengeo, Hertford.
Rouse, Rev. R. C. M., rector of Woodbridge, Suffolk; rural dean of Wilford Deanery.
Stowell, Rev. John, curate of St. Paul's, North Shore, Liverpool; incumbent of St. Bartholomew's, Liverpool.
Strickland, Rev. Dr., minister of the Chapel-of-Ease, Lower Holloway; vicar of St. Saviour's, Chelsea.
Thorne, Rev. T. Aldridge, curate-in-charge; vicar of Hart.
Tofts, Rev. Thomas Sinclair, vicar of Stockton Heath, Warrington.
Venables, Rev. George, vicar of Great Yarmouth; honorary canon in Norwich Cathedral.
Weldon, Rev. G. W., vicar of St. Saviour's, Chelsea; minister of the Chapel-of-Ease, Lower Holloway.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brasher, Rev. Samuel Benton, late vicar of St. Paul's, Derby, at Great Wenham Rectory, Colchester, on the 8th inst., aged 64.
Down, Rev. Frederick Thornton, M.A., at 19, St. Philip's-road, Surbiton, on the 11th inst., aged 34.
Earle, Rev. Henry John, at High Ongar Rectory, Essex, on the 9th inst., aged 83.
McCausland, Rev. Marcus, late rector of Birr, King's County, Ireland, at 16, Herbert-place, Dublin. on the 6th inst.
Nelson, Rev. Henry, J.P., vicar of Legsby, Lincolnshire, at Market Rasen, on the 5th inst., aged 36.
Rickards, Rev. Hely Hutchinson Keating, at Llandough Rectory, Cardiff, on the 5th inst., aged 69.
Stone, Rev. Richard Bell, vicar of Thornaby, after two days' illness from scarlet fever, at the Vicarage, South Stockton-on-Tees, on the 28th ult., aged 31.
Taylor, Rev. Charles, B.D., rector of Great Cressingham, Norfolk, and prebendary of Moreton Magna in Hereford Cathedral, at Great Cressingham Rectory, of suppressed bronchitis, on the 12th inst., aged 78.
Wildman, Rev. Thomas, D.D., incumbent of St. Andrew's, Callander, at the Parsonage, Callendar, N.B., on St. Andrew's Eve, in his 63rd year.
Wilson, Rev. John Matthias, B.D., president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, at his lodgings in the College, on the 1st inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

GOD'S PRESENCE.

By the BISHOP OF DURHAM.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge.

"Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not."—Gen. xxviii. 16.

An inobtrusive, unimpressive scene, almost indistinguishable, even to the curious eye of the archæologist, "in the maze of undistinguished hills which encompass it," with nothing to attract the eye, and nothing to fire the imagination; large slabs of bare rock traversed by a well-worn thoroughfare; "no *religio loci*, no awful shades, no lofty hills." So is the site of Bethel described by the modern traveller. Yet this was none other than the House of God; this was the very gate of heaven. An unimpressive scene in itself, but appearing still more common-place when contrasted with the famous shrines of heathendom—the rock fortress of the Athene, or the pleasant groves of Daphne, or the cloven peak of Parnassus, or the seagirt sanctuary of Delos. No beauty, no grandeur, nothing of loveliness and nothing of awe, nothing exceptional of any kind which can explain or justify its selection. Was there not ground for the wanderer's surprise on that memorable night? Why should this one spot be chosen to plant the foot of the ladder which connected heaven and earth? Why in this bleak wilderness? Why amidst these bare rocks? Why here of all places in the world? Yes, why here?

The paradox of Bethel is the paradox of the Gospel—is the paradox of God's spiritual dispensations at all times. The Incarnation itself was the supreme manifestation of this paradox. The building up of the Church was the proper sequel to the Incarnation. Look at the accompaniments of the Incarnation. Could any environment of circumstances well have been imagined more incongruous, more alien to this unique event in human history, the supreme revelation of God's wisdom, and power, and beneficence? An obscure corner of the Roman world, an insignificant and downtrodden race, scorned and hated by the rest of mankind, an ox-stall for a nursery, and a carpenter's shop for a school—what is wanting to complete the paradox? Yes, there is still one feature to be added to the picture—the crowning incongruity of all—the felon's death on the cross. Said not the prophet rightly when he foretold that there should be nothing lovely in His life and circumstances, as men count loveliness; "no form or comeliness," "no beauty that we should desire Him?"

And the same paradox which ruled the foundation of the Church extended also to its building up. The great statesmen, the powerful captains in the Kingdom of God were fishermen and tent-makers. Never was this characteristic incongruity of the Gospel more signally manifested than in the preaching of St. Paul at Athens. Have we ever realized the force of that single word with which the historian describes the impression left on the Apostle's mind by this far-famed city? Gazing on the most sublime and beautiful creations of Greek art, the masterpieces of Phidias and Praxiteles, he has no eye for their beauty or their sublimity. He pierces through the veil of the material and transitory; and behind this semblance of grace and glory the true nature of things reveals itself. To him this chief centre of human culture and intelligence, this

> eye of Greece, mother of arts
> And eloquence,

appears only as κατείδωλος, overrun with idols, beset with phantoms which mislead, and vanities which corrupt. Art and culture are God's own gifts, legitimate embellishments of life, even of worship, which is the highest form of life. But if culture aims at displacing religion, if art seeks to dethrone God, why, then, in the highest interests of humanity, be it our prayer that the sword of the barbarian and the axe of the iconoclast may descend once more and sweep them ruthlessly away. There was, at least, this redeeming feature in ancient art, that it gave expression to whatsoever sense of the Divine lay buried in the heathen mind. But art and culture which studiously ignore God—what can be said for these? In this one word κατείδωλος lies the germ of that fierce and protracted struggle of Christianity with Paganism which ended indeed in a splendid victory, though not without inflicting many a wound on humanity of which the scars and seams still remain. Notwithstanding the merciless scoffs of a Celsus and the biting sarcasm of a Julian, the Apostle's words were verified in their literal truth. Strength was made perfect in weakness. God chose the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, aye, and the uncomely things of the world to confound the beautiful. The things which are not brought to nought the things which are.

So then in its accompaniments, not less than in its main idea, this incident at Bethel is a type of the Gospel of Christ. This exile, the representative of the Israel after the flesh, prefigures a greater outcast and wanderer, the representative of the Israel after the spirit, the representative of the whole family of man. This ladder reared up from earth to heaven, whereby angels ascend and descend, what is it but the Incarnation of the

Eternal Word, wherein God is made man and man is taken up into God? This it is which establishes the title of Christianity as the absolute and final religion of the world—this indissoluble union of the human into the divine—the only one adequate response to the deepest religious cravings of mankind. Hence the Church has ever clung with a tenacity of grasp, which shallow hearts could ill understand, to this central idea, the indefeasible wedlock of heaven and earth in the God-man. And to those whose sight is purged by faith, to those who are gifted with the eye of the Spirit, the vision of Bethel will be vouchsafed with a far more exceeding glory; "Verily, verily, I say unto you. Hereafter ye shall see heaven open and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man:" on the Son of Man: yes, and on thyself too, O man, for thou art one with this Son of Man, one with the Father in Him.

"Gifted with the eye of the Spirit" I say: for in vain the heavens are riven asunder and the glory streams forth and all things are flooded with light, if the capacity of vision be absent. Only the cold bare stones beneath, only the midnight gloom overhead, only the dreary, monotonous waste around, these and these alone are visible otherwise. We have been saddened, perhaps we have been disconcerted, as recently we read the dreary epitaph which sums up the creed of a brilliant man of science not long since deceased—a hopeless, soul-less, lifeless creed, to which his own very faculties and acquisitions appear to us to give the lie. We have been saddened justly; but why should we be disconcerted? God be thanked, the most absolute childlike faith has not unfrequently been found united with the highest scientific intellect. We in this place have never yet lacked bright examples of such a union, and God grant we never may. But what right have we to expect it as a matter of course? What claim do the most brilliant mathematical faculties, or the keenest scholarly instincts give to a man to speak with authority on the things of the Spirit? Are we not told on authority before which we bow, that a special faculty is needed for this special knowledge; that "eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard"; that only the Spirit of God—the Spirit which He vouchsafes to His sons—knoweth the things of God? And does not all analogy enforce the truth of this lesson? One man has a keenly sensitive musical ear, but he is colour blind. Another has a quick eye for the faintest gradations of colour, but he cannot distinguish one note of music from another. Does the imperfect eye of the one know any haze of uncertainty over the hues of the rainbow; or the obtuse ear of the other disparage the master works of a Handel, or a Mozart, or a Beethoven? *Here* is a mathematician who sees in a sublime creation of imaginative genius only a tissue of unproven hypotheses; and *here* is a poet, to whom the plainest processes of algebra, and the simplest problems in geometry, are mere barbarian gabble conveying no distinct impression to the brain, and leaving no intelligible idea on the mind. Judge no man in this matter. To his own master he stands or falls. But judge yourselves. Yes, spare no rigour and relax no vigilance, when the judge is the criminal also. Believe it, this spiritual faculty is an infinitely subtle and delicate mechanism. You cannot trifle with it, cannot roughly handle it, cannot neglect it and suffer it to rust from disuse, without infinite peril to yourselves. Nothing—not the highest intellectual gains—can compensate you for its injury or its loss. The private prayer mechanically repeated then hurried over, then intermitted and at last dropped; the devotional reading found to be daily more irksome, because suffered to be daily more listless; the valuable moral and spiritual discipline of the early morning chapel gradually neglected; the inobtrusive opportunities of witnessing for Christ by deeds of kindness and words of wisdom suffered to slip by; these, and such as these, are the unfailing indications of spiritual decline; till disuse is followed by paralysis, and paralysis ends in death; and you are left without God in the world. And yet when again, you young men, when again in the years to come can you hope that the conditions of your life will be as favourable to this spiritual self-discipline as they are now? Where else do you expect to find in the same degree the opportunities for private meditation and retirement, the daily common prayer and the frequent communions, the inspiring and sanctifying friendships, the wholesome occupation for the mind and the healthy recreations for the body, every appliance and every aid, which if you will employ them aright, neither disusing them nor misusing them, will combine to build up and to perfect the Man of God? Choose ye, this day. To you, more especially, I appeal who have recently commenced your residence here and to whom, therefore, with the changed conditions of life a heightened ideal of life also is suggested. This is the momentous alternative. Shall your life hereafter be typified by the barren rocks and the monotonous waste, hard and dreary, if nothing worse; or shall it be illumined within and around with the effulgence of God's own presence so that—

> The earth and every common sight
> To you shall seem
> Apparelled in celestial light,
> The glory and the freshness of a dream?

A dream? nay, not a dream but an everlasting reality, eternal as God's own being is eternal.

There are two ways of looking on the relations between the things of this life and the things of eternity. A false and a true. The false way regards the one as the rejection of the other. They are reciprocally exclusive. The avocations, the interests, the amusements of daily life—nature and history, poetry and art—these are so many

hindrances to the heavenly life. Every moment given to work is a moment subtracted from prayer —thus the inward life becomes a constant reflection upon the conditions of the outward. This is the spirit which of old peopled the desert with anchorites; the spirit which in all ages, though under divers forms, has made a religion of selfishness. This is the voice which cries "Lo, here! and lo, there!" though all the while the Kingdom of heaven is within us, in the very midst of us. The true conception is the reverse of all this. Its ideal is not a separation, but an identification of the two. It takes its stand on the old maxim, "*laborare est orare.*" It strives that its work shall be prayer and its prayer shall be work. Nature and history to it are not the veil of God's presence; they are the investiture of God's glory. And, therefore, to it is vouchsafed the vision of grace and comfort and strength, as to the patriarch of old. The solitary wanderer along the dreary thoroughfare of this life lays himself down. He has nothing but the bare stones beneath for a couch, and nothing but the midnight sky overhead for a tent. He closed his eyes for a moment; and the whole place is flooded with glory. Aye, the Lord was in this place, though he knew it not; but he knows it now—knows it in the access of strength, knows it in the promise of hope, knows it in the celestial voice and the ineffable light. All the common interests of life—the associations, the amusements, the cares, the hopes, the friendships, the conflicts—all are invested with a dignity and an awe, unsuspected before. Reverence is henceforth the ruling spirit of his life. This monotonous round of common-place toils and common-place pleasures is none other than the House of God. This barren, stony, thoroughfare of life is the very portal of heaven. To read these hieroglyphics traced on nature, on history, on the human soul—to decypher this handwriting of God wheresoever it appears, and where does it not appear—is the ultimate and final study of man. All history is a parable of God's dealings; and we must learn the interpretation of the parable. All nature is a sacrament of God's being and attributes, and we must strive to pierce through the outward sign to the inward meaning. To realise God's presence, to hear God's voice, to see God's visage, let this be henceforth the aim and the discipline of our lives. So at length we shall pass from Bethel to Peniel—from the palace courts to the presence chamber itself. We shall see God face to face. It is a vision of power, of majesty, of awe unspeakable; but it is a vision also of purification, of light, of strength, of life. The blessing is won at length by that long lonely wrestling, under the midnight sky. The fraud, the worldliness, the self-seeking is thrown off like a slough. All is changed. Old things have passed away. The supplanter rises from the struggle, the supplanter no more, but the Israel, the Prince, who has power with God and with men. Shall not Moses' prayer then be our prayer, "Lord, I beseech thee, show me Thy glory"?

"Show me Thy glory." Where else shall this glory reveal itself if not in the studies of this place? These properties of numbers, these selections of space, these phenomena of light, of heat, of energy, of life, of language, of thought, what are they? Individual facts to be recorded, arranged, tabulated, marshalled under several heads, which we call laws and having so called them, with a strange self-complacency and contentment fold our hands, as if nothing more were to be done, as if by the mere imposition of a name we had crowned them absolute sovereigns of the Universe? Or are they manifestations—partial, indeed, and needing to be supplemented—of a power, a majesty, a wisdom, an order, a beneficence, a finality, a oneness, a One, who is shown to us as the Eternal Father in the revelation of the Eternal Son? Can we afford to look down from the serene heights of modern science and culture on the untutored Indian, who saw God's face in the shifting clouds and heard God's voice in the whistling winds? Nay, was there not a truth in his childish ignorance which threatens to elude the grasp of our manhood's wisdom? Was it altogether a baseless dream in those stoic Pantheists, who endowed each several planet with an animating spirit of its own? Altogether a wild fancy in those Christian fathers assigning to each its particular angel, who should whirl it through space and hold it in its course? Was it not rather a Divine instinct feeling after a higher truth? Human life cannot rest satisfied with the science of phenomena alone. It needs to supplement science with poetry. And the true, the absolute, the final poetry is the recognition of God the Creator and Governor, of God the all-wise and all-powerful, of God the Father, the Redeemer, the Sanctifier, of God the eternal love. "Blessed are they who have eyes and see,"—for to them

> The meanest flower that blows can give
> Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears—

thoughts of immortality, of wisdom, of light, of love.

"Show me Thy glory:" where else again shall His glory be seen if not in those friendships which are the crowning gift of University life? This intimate communion of soul into soul, this linking of heart with heart, is it merely a matter of human convenience, of human preference, or has it a divine side also? This love, this devotion, this reliance of the weak on the strong, this reverence for a nature purer, nobler, more upright, more manly, more unselfish than your own—what is its meaning? It is a precious, unspeakably precious gift of God, you will say—far beyond wealth, or fame, or popularity, or ease or any earthly boon of which you can conceive. Yes, but it is more than this. May we not call it in some sense a sacrament, a sign and a parable of your relation to your Lord?

You are awed—no other word will express this feeling—you are awed with the honour done to you by this friendship. You do not talk much about it—it is too sacred a thing—but you do feel it. You confess to yourself day and night your own unworthiness. And yet, though you strive to be worthy, you would not wish to feel worthy. The very sense of undeservedness invests the gift with a bountifulness and a glory which you would not forego. The fountains of your thanksgiving would cease to flow freely if you claimed it as a right; and it is a joyful and pleasant thing to be thankful. Apply this experience to the infinitely higher gift of Christ's friendship, of Christ's sacrifice. Herein lies the power of the Cross which men called and still call weakness—the power which awes, inspires, energises, elevates the heart and sanctifies the life—here in this feeling of boundless thanksgiving arises from the sense of absolute undeservedness. For is it not true, that those will love most to whom most is given and forgiven? So then this your friendship is found to be none other than the House of God. The Lord is in this place, and happy are ye, if ye know it.

Once again; look into your own soul, and what do you find there? Yes, ye yourselves are the temple of the living God. He is there—there, whether you will or not. Through your reason, through your conscience, through your remorses and regrets, through your capacity of amendment, through your aspirations and ideals, He speaks to you. You are His coinage. His image and superscription are stamped upon you. Aye, and He has also re-stamped you, re-created you, in Christ Jesus by the earnest of His Spirit. If it be true of your body that it is fearfully and wonderfully made, is it not far more true of your soul? Henceforward you will regard yourself with awe and reverence as a sanctuary of the Eternal Goodness. You will not, you dare not profane this sanctuary. Here is the true self-respect, nay, not self-respect, for self is abased, self is overawed, self veils the face and falls prostrate in the presence of Infinite Wisdom and Purity and Love thus revealed. Surely, surely the Lord was in this place—in this poor, self-seeking, restless, rebellious soul of mine, and *I*, I thought it a common thing, I went on my way heedless, I followed my own devices and desires, I knew it not.

A lady, named Searle, has sued the Rev. E. S. Lidbetter, vicar of St. Mark's, North-end, Portsea, for £1 10s., the value of a cushion placed in a pew at the church. The case had previously come before the magistrates, when it appeared that the defendant had offered to pay £1 as compensation; but the plaintiff refused to take less than £1 10s. Mr. Lidbetter (it was stated) had consulted the Bishop of Winchester, who had given it as his opinion that the cushion, having been once placed in the church, became church property. Judgment was given for £1 5s. and costs.

"THE WAY" TO HEAVEN.

By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A., Head Master of Uppingham School.

Sermon Preached in the School Chapel.

"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me."—St. John xiv. 6.

SOUL and spirit. Oh the dread significance of those two words! Who shall grasp it? Fettered, and prisoned, and pent in these fleshly bodies as we are, how can we get even a far off conception of our true selves? How can we catch a glimpse of soul and spirit as they truly are, in a world where they are masters, and with powers truly fitted to them, as shall be hereafter? One side, however, of the dread secret is not hidden from us, though we heed it not. We can see the corrupt soul moulding the body to corruption, setting its mark on it in evil, making the vile face, the diseased body, the moving example of death working in the flesh, which, alas, meets our eyes so often; when we see the handwriting of the Devil plainly written in characters of the grave; ruin to the body, and its death; and in characters of judgment to come; ruin to the soul, and its doom; on the wretched victims of self-indulgence and sin. What is this but the soul, the reality within, the unseen, marvellous lord, the mystery which we call life, the subtle mover coming out so as to be seen, and, when it is evil, imprinting in evil the dread fact of sovereign power, even in evil, over all things that it reaches, all things that belong to it, most of all its own instrument, the body. If the corrupt soul makes the body one corruption because of sin, how fearful the sovereignty of the soul appears! How dreadful the thought that what we are has such appalling power over all things outside—over all things, the body included, that the soul reaches!

Let us apply this.

> You have among you many a purchased slave,

says the great poet,

> You have among you many a purchased slave,
> Which like your asses, and your dogs, and mules,
> You use in abject and in slavish parts,
> Because you bought them; shall I say to you,
> Let them be free, marry them to your heirs?

Who does not feel the mixture of truth and falsehood in this powerful speech? The great noble could go into the slave market, he could buy the freedom of the slave, he could pardon him the crime that ofttimes made him a slave, he could set him free, he could take his burden off him, he could feed him and clothe him—but, what then? what of the after life? A life has to be lived. The man, the slave-man, lives on; he does not comes to an end; the slave-man lives on, what's to be done with him? "Marry him to your daughters," says Shylock in his bitter sarcasm. What! the slave with the slave manners, and slave mind, wed the

great Venetian ladies, and move in their palaces as lords with them! Impossible! The slave-man cannot do it. What's to become of him? There's the rub. Give him money, and let him live his own life? Is that better? Surely for the immortal spirit, the weariest and most tortured life of work, yea, the slave-life in its worst form, is better than the life of a beast, and the slave-heart turning his master's kindness and God's world into a feeding-trough in a human sty.

Apply this once more. What is Redemption to the sinner? What is pardon? What is cleansing and clothing? What is the burden taken off, and the free life? All this can be done by mere act of the Redeemer's power and goodness. But the sinner, the slave-man lives on. He does not come to an end. The slave-man lives on. What's to become of him? Here the great answer is given. Christ says, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." Christ says, "I am the Vine, and ye are the branches." Christ says, "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of Truth." Christ says, "I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." Christ says, "I pray that they all may be one as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us;" and "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." Here we have the answer. There is to be an incarnation of truth in man. Christianity, Christ-life, is not a book, not teaching only, but Christ's life, Christ in the spirit of man working new life, an incarnation of Divine power and movement, a living Spirit with a power of life sent down to live in the world, a new budding, and putting forth of new unfoldings day by day; each day, each year, each generation, with their own new birth and growth of living truth. For truth in books is dead, and can lie dead for countless years. That is not life in Christ. That is not Christianity. Christ-life is the new spirit, that by birth of water and of the Holy Spirit lives in man; the new life, that by Christ's Body and Blood, is fed and grows in man. However men may differ about this, Christ commands these two life-powers absolutely as the only way of life. And then, His Spirit in man keeps through love all His commandments, and He is the Way, and Christ's life is ever making a new world by new ways of living. All the circumstances of society are ever changing because of it. Fresh facts and problems come to light, and with them fresh possibilities of onward creation of life. For it is a creative life; fresh life moves on; fresh habits are formed; the ordinary common world gets leavened in spite of itself; and a higher range of good and evil swings into sight and has to be dealt with, which did not, and could not exist before. Take for example the slave times before Christianity, when wages were unknown, and work dishonourable. The hard, coarse state of slave and master alone gave scope for man's feelings. But now, noble work, and all the intricate problems of work, and trade, and wages, are a new world, with a new life to deal with it; and so on for ever and ever. Truth must live its way into the evil man even of common life, before the new facts take place which make newer truth possible. Christianity is truth incarnate, an ever-living, moving, creative life; not only like the planet, law and movement in itself by Christ, but a Creator also, making, as it moves, the world in which it moves. Thus Christ is the Way, for without Him there is neither the life that moves, nor the world of life in which the life moves, neither the path, within or without, the love in the spirit that guides, or the way through the new world travelled by the spirit. All is from Him, all ever new. Brethren, there is a still simpler form of this "living path" of "Christ the Way." Take a good home. How entirely a good home is a world within a world, untouched by the laws of the land so long as its own inner bond of reverence, love, and honour keeps each and all in their invisible orbits of happy life. An unfelt compulsion of resistless love makes all move in a perfect harmony of silent, unvarying peace. The love of father, mother, sister, and brother, keeping father, mother, sister, and brother in the powerful, smooth path. Each a path maker, for true love makes new truth to live. Each a mover on the path, for true love never gets in the way of others. Such is Christ's gift of true family life, a miniature world, an example of Him the Way, the Truth, the Life. This is what you all are striving to attain to, both here in this school, and at home. This is what many of you are returning to. Go home then, go home; go with the heart trained to this harmony, carry with you an ever new creation of freedom, of happiness, of life that moves in love, ready to do, aye, ready to suffer, and ever happy in doing, happy in suffering, anything and all things in the great home of love. Go then, home. Carry back from here your training, your work, your honour, and the watchful, unselfish love which alone makes home home, so will you know that Christ is the Way. Go hence then, learn to make your homes full of truth, and pure, and heavenly, so will you learn to make heaven your home, and be at home in heaven.

The Queen has granted £50 a year to the Rev. J. Jones (Idrisyn), vicar of Llandysilio, Cardiganshire, out of the Civil List Fund, in recognition of his valuable services to Welsh literature. The rev. gentleman, in addition to numerous sermons, pamphlets, and contributions to the Welsh press, is the author of a popular Welsh Commentary on the Bible in five volumes, which has passed through several editions. More than forty thousand copies of this work have been sold—a sale almost unprecedented in the history of Welsh books. Mr. Jones had the honour of being appointed a few years ago to translate into Welsh her Majesty's "Journal of our Life in the Highlands."

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1881.

SCEPTICISM.

THERE are two kinds of scepticism rife amongst us at the present day: the scepticism of religion and the scepticism of irreligion; and one seems to be as widespread as the other. One may be recognised as a call from God, which we can by no means evade; the other is often but a make-shift, used as a cloak for sin. Professor Mozeley's illustration would, indeed, be applicable here, but not to the first-mentioned; and in order to exercise charity towards those who widely differ from us, it is necessary to understand this essential difference. If we seek for anything with heartfelt earnestness, its possession must be an all-important aim; but if we have no desire to seek it, it is more than probable we shall never find it; and if it is ours by inheritance it is scarcely to our credit, we being passive agents in the matter. A conscientious thinker will not change his form of belief until he is, at least, assured that he has grasped something better, and until he can prove and testify he possesses truth in a sense he did not before, and this, according to tried and known results, verified by causes and forces which have existed long before the other long-followed system, confirmed by the great facts of the universe, and demonstrated by its immutable laws. We value the explorer, then, because of what he has discovered, and can prove, not because he is a wanderer. The desire for truth itself has its well-spring in the moral laws which govern our being, which are as powerful as those that govern the material universe—what has been called the "Instinct of Expansion" obeys a law as irrefragable as the upward growth and development of a flower. Heterodoxy may or may not be bad: it is incidental to evolution. Our religion has not remained stationary. From Judaism to early Christianity, and from that period until now, there has been both marked and gradual change: there has been growth and decadence. There has always been heresy of some sort or other: a constant warfare between the old and the new, between dogma and innovation; but there has been always a prophet or teacher to lead us onward, a herald to usher in a diviner and more marvellous light. Stagnation is death, in movement is life; running water is not always pure—it is muddiest when flooded by tides that bear down upon it with unwonted impetus, but has never the noxious exhalations of a stagnant pool. It is true that harm follows in the train of mighty changes, until things have settled down into the channels of law and order. Religion is a sacred thing, and nothing could be more opposed to true spirituality than not to recognise it as such. Old and cherished beliefs, that have been adhered to by the best and noblest of our race, and have done incalculable good, should be touched on reverently, not with sacrilegious opprobrium. No wonder that the orthodox look with horror on those who invade the sanctuary of their faith, and with unholy hands would tear down what they cannot build, whose aim is to destroy. It is not likely that they will surrender their kingdom, inherited from a remote past, without defending it unto death from the inroads of the destroyer.

Now, the implements of warfare are changed; we have the pen instead of the sword, the martyrdom of anathemas in lieu of that of the stake; there is more license than of yore, but this license is by no means pure blessing, it seems to favour the "evil as well as the good, the just as well as the unjust," so that the tares grow apace, and are like to smother up the wheat itself. If the uneducated herd "canonize" their own intellects, they will end by following their natural instincts, whether they be brutal or otherwise; then the last state of things would be worse than the first. Is there not yet another canonization of the faith of men? Is faith sinless? Or is it infallible? Can dogma prove itself? Let us possess the truth by all means, but that is the question.

In the spiritual history of our greatest teachers, there have been agonized struggles for clearer light; they have sought peace with "strong crying, and tears;" in Psalm lxxxviii. there is the fullest expression of it. Bunyan has well described it in the "Pilgrim's Progress" as the "Slough of Despond," and in his autobiography; but it is the evidence of an awakening, the precursor of a nobler life, the inrushing tides of spiritual energy which raises a man to a higher plane. We are told to "prove all things," at the same time to "hold fast that which is good." That is above all things what we ought to pray for. It is our great difficulty to know how to cast away the dross, and to retain the pure metal without alloy. There is a martyrdom when we struggle with the powers of darkness, but afterwards there is a reward—a martyr's crown and an aureole of light.

ELIZABETH J. CAROLIN.

[Mrs. Carolin, we presume, means that there are fluctuations in religious opinion, not that the Faith "once for all delivered to the saints" ever changes. God's moral laws are immutable. Our Saviour and His Apostles always recognised them as such, saying, "it is written," "it was said of old."—ED]

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

PAPER READ BEFORE THE LISMORE QUARTERLY CLERICAL MEETING.

BY THE REV. COURTENAY MOORE, M.A., RECTOR OF CASTLETOUNROCHE.

Having been asked by the chairman of the meeting to contribute a paper on the state of the soul, in the interval between the death and resurrection of the body, I have done so, endeavouring to condense the treatment of the subject as much as possible. We as members of the Irish Church are naturally bound to accept any expositions of doctrine contained in the Prayer Book as being, according to the mind of the Church, founded on the teaching of Holy Scripture; as her spiritual children we naturally accept, in the first instance at least, and act on the well-known theological maxim, "The Church teaches and the Bible proves." Applying this principle then, let us ask, Does the Prayer Book teach us anything about the subject before us? And if so, what does it teach us? That it does teach us something is sufficiently clear. If we

look, *e.g.* to those offices which naturally direct our thoughts to the momentous subject of the future life—viz., the Visitation of the Sick, and the Burial of the Dead—what do we find? Such prayers as the following:—"O Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of just men made perfect after they are delivered from their earthly prisons; we humbly commend the soul of this Thy servant, our dear brother, into Thy hands as into the hands of a faithful Creator and most merciful Saviour; most humbly beseeching Thee that it may be precious in Thy sight." Again. "Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh are in joy and felicity. We give Thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world, beseeching Thee that it may please Thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy Kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in Thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Both these prayers distinctly recognise the consciously happy existence of the souls of true believers after the death of the body, and the second prayer with great theological accuracy points out the two experiences of saved souls after death; *e.g.*, "With whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." Here is the separate existence of souls as souls. Again—"to hasten Thy Kingdom, that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in Thy eternal and everlasting glory."

Here the full fruition in connection with the Resurrection body is clearly indicated by the words, "perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul;" and this prayer (I maintain) thus clearly and fully teaches us two doctrines of the future life, which may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture. My position, then, is this, that the teaching of our Church, as founded on Scripture, presently to be shown, is that the soul is not unconscious between death and resurrection, nor at once in the enjoyment of its perfect consummation and bliss, but in joy and felicity.

And here a word or two on the miserable and monstrous heresy of unconsciousness. It would seem that this opinion has commended itself to some minds because it afforded a handy and trenchant weapon against purgatory. Unconsciousness between death and resurrection would cut away purgatory, no doubt; but it would cut away a great deal more. Short methods are not generally satisfactory; and theories, which are the outcome of what Professor Plumptre has well styled, "the insanity of controversy," cannot be expected to have a very rational basis. As we know, this heresy, which still lingers amongst us, is not of recent but of ancient origin; and therefore it would be more accurate to say that it was adopted, not invented, as suitable for the purposes of R. C. controversy. But the act was extremely unwise. Well informed R. C. theologians must know perfectly well the history of the theory in question, and could easily point out that to fight the doctrine of purgatory with *it*, was to fight it with an admittedly heretical weapon.

Besides the ordinary popular Protestant view, that there is no intermediate state at all, if true, equally disposes of the existence of purgatory without being loaded with the peril of denying the immortality of the soul, which the theory of unconsciousness really involves. This latter theory received a certain amount of support from the late Archbishop Whately, in one of his works, which probably helped to give it some acceptance in uneducated religious circles. I remember very well, at a meeting of the Theological Society in Trinity College, the late Bishop of Meath, then Regius Professor of Divinity, saying that Archbishop Whately was not a theologian at all, but a theological essayist; that he was very deficient in his knowledge of the history of doctrines, and, consequently, often attempted the solution of questions that had been already solved and determined. His speculations had the merit of being the efforts of an individual powerful mind dealing directly with a subject, and so far had their interest and value. Certainly, if Archbishop Whately knew the history of the heresy of unconsciousness—a history to which, I believe, he makes no reference—it was very strange that he gave, in any degree, the authority of his great name to such a theory. His systems of explaining Scripture were by no means safe in many instances; and the late Bishop of Ossory made a painful *argumentum ad hominem* of one of them by showing it might, with as much propriety, be employed to disprove the doctrine of the Trinity as the doctrine against which the Archbishop directed it.

It may here be noticed that the 40th of the 42 Articles of 1552 speaks as follows of the heresy aforesaid:—"The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies nor sleep idly. They which say that the souls of such as depart hence do sleep, being without all sense, feeling, or perceiving, until the Day of Judgment, or affirm that the souls die with the bodies, and at the last day shall be raised up with the same, do utterly dissent from the right belief declared to us in Holy Scripture."

Though this is no longer one of our Articles, the mind of the Church on the subject of souls dying or sleeping idly is abundantly clear from the prayers already quoted from the Visitation of the Sick and Burial of the Dead.

The intermediate state, then, is a state or place of souls, and is called Hades in the New Testament—a title which has happily been adopted by the New Testament Company in the Revised Version. In his notes on theparable of Dives and Lazarus, Archbishop Trench says:—"Abraham's bosom is a figurative phrase to express the deep quietness of an innermost communion. *Besides* the Jews, from whom the phrase is borrowed, spoke of *all* true believers as going to Abraham, as being received into his bosom. To be in Abraham's bosom was equivalent with them to being in the garden of Eden, or under the throne of glory. Christ, by using, has been rightly considered as *sanctioning* and *aaopting* the phrase; it has thus passed into the language of the Church, which has understood by it the state of painless expectation of blissful repose to intervene between the death of the faithful in Christ Jesus and their perfect consummation and bliss at His coming in His Kingdom. It is Paradise, the place of the souls under the altar; it is as some distinguish it, blessedness but not glory. Hither, to this haven of rest and consolation, Lazarus, after all his troubles, was safely borne."

It is only with the condition of the saved in the in-

termediate state that this paper deals; and as we believe them to be in a condition of conscious blessedness, the inquiry naturally suggests itself is there not also a state of progress. Reason apparently would teach us that it must be so. The very entrance within the veil; the actual contact with things hitherto unseen but eternal: this alone we would naturally suppose must even at once greatly illuminate the soul. But we are not here left to the deductions of reason alone, for Holy Scripture teaches us "that He which hath begun a good work in us will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." (Phil. i. 6.) Alford quotes a comment from Calvin upon this text as conveying *our* lesson from it. "For although those who are set free from the mortal body no longer war with carnal lusts, and may be as they say beyond the cast of the weapon: yet there will be nothing of absurdity if they are said to be in a state of advancement, because they have not yet touched all over what they desire. They do not yet possess the happiness and glory which they hoped for. Finally, the day has not yet shone which will unveil the treasures hidden in hope, and so when anything concerning hope is treated of, their eyes are always carried to the blessed resurrection as it were as to a mark." This passage from Calvin is very interesting and valuable as his exegesis of the teaching of scripture on an aspect of the intermediate state: especially as he is peculiarly free from the imputation of holding anything tinctured with Roman error upon the subject. Another very interesting note by him is quoted by Alford on Phil. i. 23. "But I am in a strait betwixt the two, having the desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better." "This place," says Calvin, "is effectual for refuting the madness of those who dream that souls separated from the bodies sleep, for Paul openly testifies that we enjoy the presence of Christ when we are unloosed."

Our inquiry so far has led us to the following conclusions—that the intermediate state is one of consciousness, of happiness, and of progress to the faithful departed. Can we know anything of its occupations? Truly we can here go no further than Holy Scripture leads us by the hand. This much I think it does tell us that the faithful departed pray. In the Revelation vi. 9, 10, the souls of the martyrs under the altar are represented as being engaged in prayer, and their prayer is answered though not in the form in which it was framed. Even Dives in his dread abode in the spirit world is represented by our Lord as retaining certain human affections, and praying that his brethren might be so signally aroused that they should not follow him to the place of torment; and if a lost soul can so remember its home on earth, and remember its still living occupants in its prayers, the deduction seems natural, indeed an *à fortiori* one, that the happy dead, the members of the Church expectant are not unmindful of those near and dear to them, who are still in the ranks of the Church militant here on earth. It may be said that the details of a parable cannot thus fairly be pressed, being merely a sort of drapery; yet let us remember that in the few parables which our Lord Himself is recorded as having explained the details *are* explained and spiritualised. And I think the inference is a fair one, that His system of explaining His own parables ought to be considered as a guide to us in explaining those of them which He has left unexplained. But I do not desire to press this point, nor to intrude with any irreverent speculation into those things which we have not seen; and it is raised chiefly that it may be considered. That the inference hold good it must be assumed that the departed are aware that the earthly life of those they have known in time still continues: whether the parable justifies this conclusion is the question.

A word before concluding on another point. Many, indeed most members of the Protestant Churches, do not believe there is any intermediate state at all, but hold that the departed pass at once into the final places of reward and punishment, viz., heaven and hell. In the Westminster Confession of Faith it is said, "The bodies of men after death return to dust and see corruption, but their souls which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal substance, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous being then made perfect in holiness are received into the highest heavens; where they behold the face of God in light and glory; waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies the Scripture acknowledgeth none." So far as the separate conscious existence of the soul after death is concerned this statement of doctrine agrees with that of our own Church; but it exceeds ours in asserting that the souls of the righteous are *there* made perfect in righteousness and enjoy the vision of God; and there is further a direct denial that there is any intermediate place of disembodied spirits.

How, then, do we prove our doctrine? Our Lord tells us that no one has ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in Heaven. (St. John iii. 13.) The Bishop of Winchester says hereon:—"If, then, no one had then ascended up to heaven except the Lord Jesus, the saints departed could not have gone to their place of final and eternal bliss, which is always called heaven."

Again, our Lord promised the thief on the Cross that he should be with Him that day in Paradise. (St. Luke xxiii. 43.)

Now Christ did not go from the Cross to heaven, but to Hades, and did not ascend to heaven until after His Resurrection. Therefore Paradise to which the thief went with Him that very day was not heaven.

Commenting on the words "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise," St. Augustine says:—"For neither in the same day was the Man Christ Jesus about to be in heaven, but in Hades as regarded His soul; in the sepulchre, on the other hand, as regarded His body."

Again, there is the broad general teaching of Holy Scripture, that it is after the Resurrection and Final Judgment that the entrance into the final abodes of happiness and misery takes place.

And the Athanasian Creed truly reproduces this Scriptural doctrine in the well-known words:—"At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire." Then we have the belief of the Jews on the subject already referred to, as adopted and sanctioned by our Lord; and there seems to be practically a unanimous consent of antiquity regarding the existence of an intermediate state. This, indeed, it is unnecessary to dwell upon. The survey of the question has necessarily been incomplete: many deep and interesting problems are involved in it, such as that which now occupies so much attention—the future of

the impenitent dead, and the primitive doctrine of prayers for the dead. Some members of the meeting may in the discussion that is to follow take up these great issues, which have necessarily been omitted in the paper.

As regards the dead in Christ, we know they have entered into the rest that remaineth for the people of God: that they are blessed, that they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them; and that He who has begun a good work in them will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.

> We ceased: a gentler feeling crept
> Upon us: surely rest is meet:
> They rest, we said; their sleep is sweet,
> And silence followed, and we wept.
>
> Our voices took a higher range;
> Once more we sang: they do not die,
> Nor lose their mortal sympathy,
> Nor change to us, although they change.
>
> Rapt from the fickle and the frail
> With gathered power, yet the same,
> Pierces the keen seraphic flame
> From orb to orb, from veil to veil.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Modern Atheist:" A Sermon preached in Christ Church, Homburg, Aug. 28, 1881. By the Rev. C. B. Brigstocke, M.A., Chaplain. Published by request. London: Hatchards. 1881.

So long as human nature is limited by the conditions which pertain to this present life, and is unable to apprehend the personality and character of its Creator by the direct evidence of sense; so long as we can neither see God with the eyes, feel Him with the hands, nor realise His presence directly by any of the faculties whereby we recognise the existence of material beings; so long, apparently, there will be not only diversities of opinion as to the nature and operations of this Unseen Power, but perhaps there will always be some who cannot conceive the existence of a Being so infinite, and who therefore will in fact refuse to believe at all in the existence of a Personal Deity. When this expression of unbelief takes the form of simple Agnosticism; when a man merely declares his own ignorance and inability to attain to any certain knowledge of God, and declares this with becoming modesty, without presuming to dogmatize on the subject, then, his attitude, as this author observes, "if it does not command our sympathy, is at any rate entitled to our respect." But unhappily there are some who are not satisfied with this position; not content with avowing that they themselves cannot understand or believe in God, they presume to assert positively that "there is no God"—no Supreme Creator at all: and although, as this writer well points out, it is absolutely impossible for them to prove this negative proposition, they insist upon it with as much vehemence and as much intolerance as if it had been established by positive and mathematical demonstration. This is the spirit against which Mr. Brigstocke earnestly protests in this sermon: and, with every desire to avoid misrepresenting our opponents, and especially to eschew the heated language which is so often heard in theological controversy, in this case we fear it must be admitted that the character here given of the modern Atheist is too truly justified by the facts—by the language of their publications, and by their public, political action.

However, a creed is not to be judged altogether by the extravagances of some of its adherents; and just as we must acknowledge that even among professed Christians, many things are said, and done, which are very inconsistent with the pure spirit and truth of Christianity, and which therefore true Christians are always anxious to repudiate; so we are willing to suppose that there may be some honest and reverent minds, who, even though they cannot subscribe to our belief in the Divine Creator, yet are willing to respect the faith of those who do believe; and, at any rate, will take no part in treating such faith with ribald mockery. Let such men, if such there be, come forward from whatever quarter, and approach the great problem of the universe with an honest desire to find the truth, with perfect freedom to think and express whatever their Reason dictates, and with such modesty as is becoming to a creature of such limited life and powers as man; let them do this in a spirit of human brotherhood and mutual forbearance, and then we doubt not others will be ready to meet them in the same brotherly spirit, and with the same high object in view—without which indeed all religion is but a mockery—the discovery, the knowledge of the Truth.

"St. Giles' Lectures," Second Series. I. Brahmanism. II. Buddhism. By the Very Rev. John Caird, D.D. Blackwoods.

"Three Sermons." By the Rev. F. V. Thornton, Rector of South Hill with Callington. Rivingtons.

"The Believing Sufferer." By W. Tait, D.D., Incumbent of Trinity Church, Pau, France. Nisbet and Co. Pp. 38.

The second series of "St. Giles' Lectures," on "the faiths of the world," now in course of delivery both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, is worthily led off by Principal Caird, whose wide acquaintance with philosophical systems peculiarly fits him to expound the root-ideas of the religions of India, whether of the Brahmanist or the Buddhist type. Starting from the idea that the chief pre-Christian religions contain the germs of true conceptions of God and of His relations to the world, but present them in so one-sided and fragmentary a manner as practically to falsify them and make them the sources of pernicious error; in the first lecture he traces the development of the pantheism of the Vedas into the polytheistic nature-worship and the system of Caste, which characterise full-grown Brahmanism. Hindoo Pantheism had its origin in the sense of the vanity and unreality of the world and of all finite things. The mind brooding over this began to say to itself, "There is a substance beneath these shadows, a something that is, and abides, underlying all these fleeting, phantasmal forms that only seem to be." Of this ultimate substance, this divine reality, the most stable and glorious objects in nature then presented themselves as symbols—the sun, the stars, the earth, the hills, the great rivers, the all-embracing heavens—and thus a vague nature-worship sprang up, which led at last in the popular conception to an almost indiscriminate deification of common objects. Somehow it was felt God must be in all; in the vile, obscene, and deformed, as well as in the noble and beautiful, and pure; so even beasts and reptiles become objects of worship; even the lowest appetites and grossest impurities became consecrated by a Divine presence. Thus arose the monstrous pantheon and the hideous superstitions of

modern Hinduism. And Caste followed naturally. For Pantheism—God in all—by consecrating everything, fosters a "fatalistic contentment with things as they are," and thus tends to stereotype and render ineffaceable the existing divisions of society. It was as a reaction against the intolerable burden of this system that Buddhism arose; and the way in which it met the cry of the soul for something better, and yet itself fell short through resting in a negation instead of leading on to a diviner life, is well traced out in the second lecture. Anyone who desires to understand the relation of these two religions to each other, and their admixture of truth with error, will find here much help in a short compass.

The next book on our list is printed, we suppose, for local circulation chiefly, as it has scarcely substance enough to challenge public attention. Of the three sermons we like the last best, which from Zechariah's prediction, that "Holiness unto the Lord" shall be on the bells of the horses, urges the religious consecration of the whole of human life. The doctrine is excellent, but why it should be selected for an ordination sermon is not at first sight obvious. It is, however, ingeniously made the ground of warning the clergy against assuming the position of a separate class or priestly caste. For if they do, they virtually maintain the idea of an official or professional holiness, and lower the standard of holiness for the laity; they pose before the laity as persons from whom, if possible, all evil is to be concealed; and they fail to weave their lives in with the lives of their people, and to carry the sanctifying power of religion into all the activities and struggles of human existence. The practical outcome is the advice—Don't be separate from your flocks; don't wear an air of professional sanctity; don't exhaust yourselves in study and contemplation and public worship, and visits to the sick; be men among men, going in and out among all, weaving in your lives with theirs, carrying your sympathy and help into all the currents and struggles of common life. Thus only will you leaven the mass, and help to bring about the day of the prophet's vision, when even the bells of the horses shall bear the legend "Holiness unto the Lord."

Dr. Tait's pamphlet comes to us from the favourite winter-station of Pau, where he has been for a long time English Chaplain, and it pleasantly reminds us of the good work which is being done across the water by many of our English clergy. To some of our readers he is probably no stranger, as several thoughtful treatises have already issued from his study. In the pages now before us his object is to maintain the truth that our Lord's human life was a life of faith, and that faith was His support in His Passion and Death just as truly as in all His previous life of active obedience to His Father. The special use to which this truth is turned is to enforce a protest against the popular view that our Lord on the Cross was *penally forsaken* by God, and instead of being sustained by His Father, to whom He clave with unfaltering filial trust, was self-sustained by virtue of His own inherent Deity. Against this view Dr. Tait urges, and we think justly, that it involves an inconceivable separation in the Godhead, implies the infliction of a doom on the Son of God which is "impossible of faith," impairs the truth of Christ's humanity, and destroys the pertinency of His example. There is, in fact, but a single expression in the Bible which supports it even in appearance, namely, the quotation by our dying Redeemer of the words, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" and Dr. Tait forcibly shows how very far this is from giving any real substance to what he calls "the theological phantom—a Saviour abandoned of God." "Were we asked," he says, "to name a Scripture which, if language has meaning, *demonstrates* the theory of the Saviour's desertion to be baseless and untrue, we should, without a moment's hesitation, name the 22nd Psalm." And as to the supposed testimony of other parts of the Bible, he writes just as strongly: "If penal desertion by God was indeed an essential part of the Saviour's Atonement, why have inspired Apostles been silent on so grave and solemn a matter? We have carefully gone through the sermons and Epistles of St. Peter; we have done the same with those of St. Paul; we have searched also the Gospel and Epistles of St. John. The theory of penal desertion is not to be found in any of them. Nor is it to be found in any part of the New Testament. The modern language on this subject is totally unknown to the New Testament; the entire idea which it expresses is foreign to its pages. When we have been accustomed to believe anything we are very apt to say, there are many Scriptures to prove it, if we only looked for them. Let those who say so look for such Scriptures, and find *even one*."

CORRESPONDENCE.

EVOLUTION AND THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I think many of your readers will consider the reply of the Rev. T. G. Bonney quite as unsatisfactory as it appears to the Rev. R. Galbraith, nor can I see how it can be much assistance to any one in the difficult task of endeavouring to reconcile to the minds of intelligent young people the statements of Scripture with the theory of evolution. Supposing even that we do succeed in convincing them that the words "six days" in the Fourth Commandment ought to be interpreted as meaning six periods, and God resting the seventh day as meaning a diminished rate of evolution, while they are to take the word "day" in its literal sense when it says "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt do no manner of work," what follows? We are forthwith confronted with further difficulties, towards the explanation of which the Rev. T. G. Bonney gives us no assistance whatever. We read, for instance, that "the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and He took one of his ribs, and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made He woman." Now this is either the account of a real occurrence which could have become known to man only by the direct revelation of God, or it is a simple myth; and if the former, how is it to be reconciled with the evolution hypothesis? It seems to me that the clearly-stated position of Mr. Galbraith is impregnable, namely, that if we accept evolution "it will necessitate very different views of Scripture from those generally held."

Dec. 18th. (MRS.) C. STUART.

SIR,—I am sorry I have not Robertson's "Life and Letters" in the edition Mr. Galbraith possesses. The letter was written between October, 1849, and December, 1850, and the part in it I wished to point out was this:—"You find in the Book of Genesis two

distinct accounts of the Creation: one in chap. i. to chap. ii. 4; the other from chap. ii. 4 to the end, beginning, 'These are the generations,' &c., which is the common and well-known way of commencing a history. In these two histories there are even discrepancies. For instance, in the first, man is created male and female at once. In the first, animals are created on separate days before man; in the second, chap. ii. 19, they are created after man, and brought to him to name." I should, however, rather have referred Mr. Galbraith to the following passage in Mr. Haweis's suggestive sermon "On the Essence of the Bible" in his "Thoughts for the Times," p. 150:—"In the Bible there is not one standard but many standards. There is a progressive morality unfolded to you throughout it. There are primitive and childish views of God to be found there, which we cannot endorse without irreverence, because the world has outgrown them. The person who wrote down the story of Eden talks of the Almighty as of a man walking in the garden in the cool of the day, smelling burnt meat, and resting after work, and so forth. That is the expression of a simple age. It is a beautiful expression, but still it reflects a state of human culture that hardly exists in Europe at all. We could never bear to speak of God in that manner now." The ideas of the universe having been completed in six days, and of man being in shape a likeness of God, fit in naturally into the above strain of thought.

No doubt "the intellect is capable of sin," and does sin when it upholds a course of action which my conscience—the Voice of God in me—condemns; but when my intellect, obeying the Apostle's injunction to the Beræans, is charged with sinning, proven by its being the subject of misery, doubt, and inquietude, my God-given instincts revolt against the charge, and I am content to be without praying for the "tranquil land-locked bay" until I am convinced that the Laureate was wrong when he wrote—

> There lives more faith in honest doubt,
> Believe me, than in half the creeds.

Dec. 20th, 1881. BROADCHURCH.

EARLY COMMUNION.

SIR,—In reference to the subject of Early *versus* Evening Communion—a subject anxiously discussed at the present time in the columns of a contemporary—may I be permitted to urge the importance of introducing evening celebrations of the Lord's Supper wherever it is practicable to do so, as a means of grace to many souls, and a confession of the supremacy of the example of Christ, and the teaching of Scripture and reason, as against *tradition* and *instinct*.

Allow me, also, to state some objections to Early Communion, as compared with the later hour—objections which seem to me unanswerable. At any rate, I should be glad to know whether Scripture or reason can be alleged against Evening Communion. The objections which occur to my mind against Early Communion are these:—

1. The Morning Celebration is not in accordance with the original institution.

2. Early communion has proved to be the fruitful source of superstition and idolatry—mass-mongering, and so forth.

3. Early Communion has proved itself productive of Sabbath desecration for the rest of the day.

4. Early communion admits of no adequate time for preparation. People rise, dress, rush to the holy table, and all is over in about twenty-five minutes. It is "*Communion made* easy."

5. Early Communion fails to mark the *hour* of the great *event* it should commemorate.

6. Early Communion celebrates the *Resurrection*, not the *death*, of Christ.

7. The Jews did not dare to change the hour of their Paschal feast.

8. There is no record in Scripture of change of hour of Communion up to about A.D. 96.

9. Tertullian, about A.D. 200, first mentions Early Communion, and alleges *tradition* as the authority for the change from evening to morning.

10. St. Chrysostom, who practised Fasting Communion says that they who object to Evening Communion must depose Christ, who gave it to His Apostles in the evening.

11. St. Cyril alleges in favour of Early Communion that the ordinance commemorates the *Resurrection*.

12. The excellent Dean of Norwich rests Early Communion on *instinct*, not being able to find reason or Scripture for it, as does the late Canon Ashwell.

13. Evening Communion affords a whole holy day for meditation; it tends to the sanctification of the day thereby; it does not foster superstition; it is frequented by the serious; it is a good ending of the sacred day; it crowns gloriously the services which have gone before, and it sends the worshipper to lie down in his bed in the exercise of faith, hope, charity, in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to Eternal life when awaked from the last long sleep of the grave.

PRESBYTER.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson, Rev. Michael Angelo, honorary canon in Norwich Cathedral.
Bacon, Rev. Maunsell John, vicar of Swallowfield, Berks.
Bennetts, Rev. John James, rector of West Camel.
Blenkarne, Rev. James Cutcliffe, vicar of Skellingthorpe.
Bliss, Rev. Thomas, vicar of Ewell.
Blomfield, Rev. George Pinchin Allas, curate of Uffculme, Devon; vicar of Camrose, Pembrokeshire.
Bowen, Rev. Charles James, rector of St. Lawrence, Denton; rector of Wroot.
Box, Rev. Wesley Coke, vicar of Orton-on-the-Hill.
Bradley, Very Rev. G. G., dean of Westminster; acting chaplain of the Queen's Westminster Rifles.
Brasher, Rev. Samuel Benton, rector of Wenham Magna, Suffolk.
Brec, Rev. Charles Herbert, curate of Washford Pyne; rector of Washford Pyne.
Brooke, Rev. Charles, vicar of Grendon.
Browne, Rev. John James, perpetual curate of Milton; perpetual curate of Penkhull.
Bulmer, Rev. George Frederick, curate of Holmer; vicar of Canon Pyon.
Burnaby, Rev. Robert William, vicar of East Cowes.
Clarke, Rev. Charles John, rector of Wanstrow.
Davies, Rev. George Jennings, vicar of Timsbury.
Davies, Rev. Thomas Hughes, curate of Castle Caereinion; vicar of Bettws Caedewen.
Davidson, Rev. Randall Thomas, examining chaplain to the bishop of Durham.
Doherty, Rev. E. J., vicar of St. John's, Plumstead, Kent.
Feilden, Rev. John R., vicar of Honingham with East Tuddenham, near Norwich.
Fowell, Rev. Charles Wellesley, perpetual curate of Otterford.
Guest-Williams, Rev. William Siller, vicar of Birtley.
Hall, Rev. William John, minor canon; junior cardinal in St. Paul's Cathedral.
Hedley, Rev. Thomas, rector of Grundisburgh, Suffolk.
Holden, Rev. Henry, rector of South Luffenham.

Hunt, Rev. T. H., vicar of Badsey and vicar of Wickhamford; rural dean of Evesham Deanery.
Hunter, Rev. Archer George, vicar of Christ Church, Epsom.
Hurd, Rev. Walter Robert, vicar of Oadby.
Hurst, Rev. John Palmer, rector of Thakeham, Sussex.
Johnstone, Rev. Richard, curate; rector of Morcton Say.
Kilpeck, Rev. W. J., senior curate of St. Paul's, Maidstone; vicar of St. Mary's, Pembroke.
Lewin, Rev. Samuel, vicar of North Willingham.
Mangin, Rev. Samuel Wareing, vicar of Bramshaw.
Martin, Rev. William, incumbent of St. Augustine's, Bradford; perpetual curate of Newhall.
Medwin, Rev. Thomas Rea, rector of Astwick with Arsley.
Molyneux, Rev. George, vicar of Penkhull; perpetual curate of Milton.
Orpen, Rev. Thomas Herbert, vicar of All Saints', Cambridge.
Piggott, Rev. John Cornell, curate of Maryport; vicar of Gilcrux.
Pittar, Rev. Charles Arthur, rector of Melmesby.
Reynolds, Rev. Bernard, curate of Wimbledon; assistant diocesan inspector of schools.
Richardson, Rev. Walter Hinde, curate of Calne; perpetual curate of Holy Trinity, Barnstaple.
Ridley, Rev. Charles George, vicar of Hundleby; rector of Braytoft and vicar of Irby.
Simpson, Rev. William Sparrow, minor canon; sub-dean of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Smyth, Rev. Arthur, vicar of Hanney with Hagnaby and Markby.
Swann, Rev. Henry Aldersey, vicar of Great Ashfield.
Thornton, Rev. Claude Cecil, perpetual curate of High Cross.
Tomkins, Rev. James Peebles Oman, vicar of Wistow-cum-Newton Harcourt, and vicar of Kilby.
Townsend, Rev. John Hume, perpetual curate of St. Mark, Broadwater, Sussex.
Tudor, Rev. Harry, rector of Wolborough, and chaplain of Newton Abbot Workhouse.
Westropp, Rev. John Thomas, perpetual curate of Witham Friary.
Wilcox, Rev. Henry Jenkyns, incumbent of Nettleden; perpetual curate of Cockshutt.
Williams, Rev. Robert Price, rector of Rotherfield Peppard, Oxon.
Winchley, Rev. C. R. Thorold, curate of Ilsham, Torquay.
Woosnam, Rev. Charles Maxwell, vicar of St. Peter, North Shields.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Moneypenny, Rev. James Isaac, of Pitmilly, and late vicar of Hadlow, Kent, at Pitmilly, Fife, on the 14th inst., aged 82.
Parker, Rev. Charles William, priest, vicar of Downton, formerly rector of Bulvan, Essex, on the 16th inst., aged 48.
Ragg, Rev. Thomas, vicar of Lawley, at Lawley, on the 3rd inst., aged 73.
Richards, Rev. E. Valentine, M.A., rector of South Wootton, Norfolk, at Lewes, on the 15th inst., aged 48.
Steel, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., formerly fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, late of the Grove, Harrow-on-the-Hill, and for thirty-nine years assistant-master of Harrow School, at 28, Norham-gardens, Oxford, on the 6th inst., aged 75.
St. Leger, Rev. Edward F., rector of Scotton, Kirton-in-Lindsey, Lincolnshire, at 19, Bedford-circus, Exeter, on the 5th inst., aged 49.

Mr. Edward Gairdner, of Gairdner and Son, attended at Whistley Mill Farm, near Twyford, to-day (20th instant), to distrain for tithes, amounting to over £48. Nine beasts which had been seized were bought in by Mr. Wingfield, of Hungerford, for £59 15s. 8d. Mr. Wingfield counted the money into a sieve, saying £30 was for the bishops, £10 for the poor curates, £6 for the vicar of the parish, and the residue "for the poor tools who had turned his cattle into golden images." About a hundred farmers were present, who hooted and groaned. A public meeting was previously held, when resolutions were passed condemning the Tithes Commutation Act of 1836, and asking for its repeal or amendment.—*Globe.*

On the Fourth Sunday in Advent, while the Bishop of Lincoln was ordaining a large number of priests and deacons in the cathedral church of St. Mary, Lincoln, the Bishop-Suffragan of Nottingham (who is also Archdeacon of Stow) ordained priests the two curates of Stow-in-Lindsey, the Rev. E. S. Prideaux Brune, B.A. Oxon, and the Rev. C. T. Duffin, of the Scholæ Cancellarii, Lincoln, in the old Saxon cathedral of St. Mary, Stow, the mother church of the diocese, as it is affectionately called in its own neighbourhood. The ordination sermon was preached by the Rev. R. Ainslie, Canon of Lincoln, late vicar of Great Grimsby, and the Bishop preached in the evening. An ordination of four deacons was held at Stow by the late Bishop Mackenzie, Suffragan of Nottingham, in September, 1877; but there is no tradition of an ordination of priests, though such may have taken place when the Bishop of Lincoln had a residence at Stow Park, which was alienated at the Reformation. A simultaneous ordination in the old and new cathedrals, both dedicated to St. Mary, we may feel sure has never occurred before. May it be a type of old and new being blended in reinvigorated energies for the future of the Church in this country, which has passed through many outward perils, sustained by the divine Presence in her!

On Friday, the 16th, a very interesting service was held to inaugurate the opening of a small Home of Mercy at 4, Mount Row, Davies Street, Berkeley Square, in the parish of St. George's, Hanover Square. There were present several ladies who have been instrumental in starting the work, with their friends; also the Rev. Capel Cure, the Rev. W. J. Ayre, of St. Mark's, Audley Street; the Rev. A. G. Jackson, and the Rev. Vincent Borradaile. After a hymn, the Litany and special prayers were said by the Rev. A. G. Jackson, and a most earnest and impressive address was given by the Rev. Capel Cure, full of hope and encouragement to those about to begin such an anxious work. It is contemplated to receive eight or ten penitents, very young, not the low and depraved, preference being given to those about to become mothers. It is intended to be a bright, cheerful shelter, all the surroundings being calculated to promote that end. All particulars may be had on application to the chaplain or lady-superintendent.

The council of the Church Association has adopted a resolution expressing their satisfaction at the public action of Canon Girdlestone in objecting to the use of the pulpit of Bristol Cathedral by a clergyman who wilfully disregards the laws of the Church of England and the expressed wishes of his Diocesan. The council say they feel assured that "if the firmness and high sense of duty displayed by Canon Girdlestone were more frequently exhibited by those in authority, a great discouragement would be given to clerical lawbreakers, and the spirit of lawlessness, unhappily too prevalent, would receive a decided check. The council begs to tender to Canon Girdlestone its very cordial thanks." In acknowledging this vote Canon Girdlestone writes: —"It was a most unpleasant duty which I had to discharge. But the discharge of duty, however unpleasant, must not be evaded. The sympathy of the council of the Church Association as expressed in the resolution is very encouraging, and I value it much. I have received from all parts of the country a large number of pats on the back of the same description, but at the same time, happily, a sufficient amount of slaps in the face, chiefly anonymous, to keep me humble."

The Church of England Pulpit.

IMMORAL ACQUIESCENCE: AN APPEAL FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF A NATIONAL DUTY.

By CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

PART OF A SERMON PREACHED AT WESTMINSTER ABBEY ON SUNDAY, DEC. 10TH, 1881.

"If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; if thou sayest, Behold, we knew it not; doth not He that pondereth the heart consider it?"—PROV. xxiv. 11, 12.

WHAT is the object of sermons? Whatever other objects they may have, surely this object at least is clear and indisputable—they should aim at making men better, and so at making the world happier. They are meant to promote religion. Well, let it be written with a pen of iron on the rock for ever that the sole genuine outcome of religion is goodness. They are meant for the furtherance of the Gospel; and the Gospel does not mean a few picked phrases for "the elect," but means glad tidings—on earth peace, goodwill towards men. The form of godliness is worse than a whited sepulchre without its power; and what we want is not merely to enable this or that man to go about saying, "I am converted," but it is to bring heaven nearer to our earth. Some may preach about *minutiæ* of dogma, and others about varieties of organisation. For myself, I desire to be, as Noah was, as Samuel was, as the Prophets were, as John Baptist was; aye, as the Lord Christ was, a preacher of righteousness. Wesley, who roused to reality a greedy and slumbering age, even at the close of his long career recalled with gratitude the advice of Archbishop Potter, "If you desire to be useful do not spend your time and strength in contending about what is disputable, but in testifying against open and notorious vice, and in promoting real and spiritual holiness." But is it never necessary to rebuke the open and notorious vices of nations? If the Prophets of old spoke to nations, ought not a national message to be sometimes uttered from such a pulpit as this—whence, surely, all the mere littlenesses and vanities of ecclesiasticism ought to be excluded, and where—amid whatever sneers and depreciations of party bitterness—the healthy conscience of the nation ought to find a voice?

I purpose, then, this afternoon, God helping me, to speak about one or two out of many topics, respecting which it is of vital importance that the conscience of the nation should be aroused. And do not think that because they are national questions, therefore you in your shop, or your office, or your luxurious home, have nothing to do with them. National evils involve national responsibility. National follies end in national loss. National crimes produce national disasters. When as a nation we defied sanitary laws, the Plague—which was the mediæval Nemesis on such uncleanliness—smote all alike with absolute impartiality. Ten years ago, with a light heart, a neighbouring nation plunged vaingloriously into a needless war. The total collapse which ensued—the wasting of her provinces, the loss of her territory, the burning of her capital, the burden of her mulct, the humiliation of her catastrophe—were attributed by her own greatest writers to the fretting plague-spot of godless immorality which she had suffered to eat out the heart of her individual sons. Because the moral law was written for nations no less than individuals, therefore on all men indiscriminately do the penalties of its violation fall. Men who live under irresistible despotisms may be less responsible, but we are free. Our fathers purchased our freedom with their blood. It is our voice which summons or dismisses the Governments which make our laws; and not only ought we to consider it an act of guilty meanness to sell our own votes for any consideration, or to induce others to sell theirs, but we are individually responsible for using our votes, and every power which we possess, to insist that policy should be under the absolute sway of morals, and that reverence should be paid to Mercy and Justice as to the clear will of God.

* * * *

And, to touch on one more topic, may it not be that to the neglect of adequate means to guide and amuse our youth is due the fact that *the state of the streets and parks of London at night* is more shamefully immoral, and therefore more utterly repellent, than those of almost any great city in the world? So at least those testify who profess to know. I will say nothing of what any may see for themselves; nothing of places of amusement, semblably innocent, but in reality centres of corruption; nothing of the appalling evidence which rushes in upon those who dare to consider this subject; but I will quote the single testimony of one of those eminent foreign physicians who worshipped in this Abbey during the Medical Congress in July. In recording his impressions of England he says that "Men call the capital of France the modern Babylon, and say that vice and immorality have nowhere a freer field. But this reputation of Paris is in reality exaggerated, and prudish England must in this respect certainly bear the palm. After having traversed many a street, and many a city, nowhere have I seen such a state of things as may be seen nightly in certain London thoroughfares. It is a veritable market of iniquity, held under the eyes of the police, who take no notice of it. The Faubourg Montmartre of

Paris is as Eden compared to Piccadilly Circus." There, then, is the charge in the plain bare fact of it, as given by a competent and an impartial witness And if it be true, put this plain question to the conscience of the nation—ought these things so to be? Citizens of London, you who profess to be, and are, honest, sober, God-fearing men—are you content with this reputation of your great capital? Is it your will that in London, as in Ephesus or Babylon of old, there should be open merchandise, not of gold and silver only, but also of the bodies and souls of men? Is it nothing to you that thousands of women, who might once have worn in unpolluted innocence the rose of matronly honour, should be thus hideously trampled under foot? Is it nothing to you that so many youths, often when reason is so weak and passion so headstrong, should ruin their opening lives, and should at last lie down in the grave with their bones full of the sin of their youth, to bequeath perhaps to miserable generations the clinging and inerádicable curse? Ought these things so to be? And if not, are we so legislatively feeble, so individually apathetic, as to say that there is no remedy for such things as these?

I address these questions to the conscience of the nation; and what will you answer? I know that you will not give the answer of Godless indifference, which, content for itself with a calculated immorality, suffers its victims to be swept unpitied to their doom. You will not give this answer, for you are Christians. Will you, then, talk to me about liberty? To me there seems to be no conception of liberty so false and so deadly as that which, perilously confounding it with licence, connects it any way with the unchecked immunities of temptation, and multiplied facilities for vice. Are you interfering with liberty when you close gambling hells, when you put down nuisances, when you protect dumb animals from needless cruelty, when you suppress immoral literature, when you interfere with the sale of poisons? And, if not, why should you invoke that sacred name, why should you shoot out your arrows from behind that stainless shield, when the question is whether as a nation, you will try, or not try, to save myriads of men your brothers, and women your sisters, from unprotected precipitation into vices of which the curse is handed on from generation to generation to poison the blood of children yet unborn? Do not repeat to me the stale sophism that you cannot make men moral by Act of Parliament. We only ask that they should not be made immoral. If you cannot arrest the determination of the depraved, at least do not neglect the innocent and abandon the wavering. If you cannot promote virtue, at least minimise the facilities for vice. "You cannot pave the bottomless pit." No! but is that to furnish you with an excuse for suffering to be made ever smoother and smoother the path which slopes to it?

And shall custom excuse you? Ah! let me tell you that nations are not long suffered to harden themselves in callousness. It has been rightly said that "the course of all the evils in the world may be traced to that most deadly error of human indolence and corruption, that it is our business to preserve and not to improve." Immoral acquiescence in preventible evils is neither more nor less than the painlessness of the wound which has begun to mortify; it is the final curse of cities and of communities whose shame has become incurable, because it has become first familiar, and finally unblushing.

In appealing, then, to the conscience of the nation I would appeal to you. The audiences gathered in this place are large and miscellaneous. Therefore to the young men and young women here, who are the hope of the future, I would appeal, not only to place their own lives under the great Angel of Purity, praying to God that they may turn at once, with haughty fastidiousness and abhorrent pity, from every approach to those sins which murder alike their own souls and the souls of others for whom Christ died; but also I would entreat them by the love of God and the tenderness of Christ that they would not, by adding to man's shame and wickedness, rob themselves, at the very beginning of life, of that best hope for which any man can live—a hope for the amelioration of the world. And to those who yearn to break the force of sin I appeal to take the right view on these matters, and to help the growth of virtuous and manly opinion, bearing in mind that to you it may be granted to shape the public voice, and that "the public voice shakes the palace, the public voice penetrates the grave, the public voice precedes the chariot of Almighty God, and is heard at the judgment-seat." And to those who make our laws, and control our institutions, I appeal by the sacred principle that, if it be "the duty of every Government to make it easy to do right, and difficult to do wrong," it must be yet more imperatively its duty to reverse the conditions which, at this moment, and on every side of us, make it all but impossible for thousands to do right, and fatally inevitable that tens of thousands will do wrong.

But, if public opinion be apathetic, if immoral acquiescence triumph, if legislation refuse its aid, then lastly I appeal to you—if such yet be left us—to you, sons of God, called by voices of irresistible command, anointed by hands of invisible consecration!—to you, strong and clear-sighted souls, to whom it is given to rouse the consciences of nations, and, in spite of the agonised screams of offended vanity, to burn up epigrams and sophisms in the fire of your moral indignation! Fools, thank God, rush in where angels fear to tread. And when such fools—the saints, the reformers, the philanthropists whom comfortable sinners and well-to-do monopolists call by that name—priests whom all other priests hate—preachers who have

"as many stones flung at them as other men have flowers"—true men whom the mean and the conventional ever accuse of disturbing the peace of the Church and of the world,—when these fools have led the forlorn hopes of humanity to storm the strong towers of custom and to "smite the hoary head of inveterate abuse," then, perhaps, the world's iceclad angels of officialism may begin to follow them, and religionists, ceasing from the jangle of their party recriminations, may crowd in where God's fools have led the way to snatch from them the sole crown which the fools of God do not value—the crown of earthly gratitude, the reward of earthly honour. Yea, while some are squabbling as though the universe depended on phrases or on ornaments,—Oh God, give us saints! saints who will recognise that all the just and the true and the humble, whatever they call themselves, are of one religion, the religion of the Ten Commandments, the religion of the Eight Beatitudes!—saints who will recognise that the one thing, and the only thing which God requires of men and of nations is to do justice, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God!

For if not—if God gives us no saints even to win His cause by suffering, and for His sake to forego the sleek applause of men, and to welcome the beatitude of their malediction—if He grants us no St. Francis, no Savonarola, no Luther, no Howard, no Clarkson, no Wesley or Whitefield—then be sure that the axe is already uplifted in the air. Slow and silent, but certain, is the working of God's inexorable law. It is deaf to sophistry; it is heedless of vested interests; it is pitiless to excuses. Upon callous immorality, upon cold acquiescence in wrong, out of the darkened future it breaks at last, "a Nemesis crowned with fire," trampling guilty nations into indiscriminate ruin, laying waste fenced cities into ruinous heaps. Nature and Destiny are but other names for this irresistible Providence. For men and for nations it has but one law—sow and reap. Sow to the spirit, and reap eternal life. Sow to the flesh and reap corruption. Sow the wind, and reap the hurricane. "To burn away in mad waste"—so wrote the great moralist who has recently passed away from us, "the divine aromas and plainly celestial elements from our existence—to change our holy of holies into a place of riot, to make the soul itself hard, impious, barren. Surely a day is coming when it will be known again what virtue is in continence of life; how divine is the blush of young human cheeks; how high, beneficent, sternly inexorable, if forgotten, is the duty laid, not on women only, but on every creature in regard to these particulars. Well, if such a day never comes again, then I perceive much else will never come. Magnanimity and depth of insight will never come; heroic purity of heart and of eye; noble pious valour to amend us and the age of bronze and lacquer—how can they ever come? The scandalous bronze-lacquer age of hungry animalisms, spiritual impotencies and mendacities, will have to run its course, till the pit swallow it." Oh, England! "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace!" May the day never come "in which they shall be hid from thine eyes."

SUFFERINGS AND PATIENCE OF JESUS.

By the Rev. H. HARRIS DAVIES, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.H.S., Vicar of Llangoed, Anglesea.

Sermon Preached at Llangoed Church. Dedicated to Mrs. Mitchell, Lleiniog Castle, Beaumaris.

"Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not."—1 Peter ii. 23.

ST. PETER in the preceding verses exhorts all Christian converts, both Jews and Gentiles, to be always ready to pay all due and proper respects to all ranks and conditions of men. This must have appeared "an hard saying" to some of them, especially to the Jews, with whom it was a maxim that the whole world was given to them, and that they should have supreme rule everywhere, and that all the Gentiles were to be their vassals. With such high political notions, and being always ready to boast, saying, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man," there was a danger that many of them might still be infected with their former proud and unruly sentiments, and therefore the Apostle shows them that they were, notwithstanding their great honours and privileges, as converts to Christianity, still bound by the strongest obligations of duty, as well as conscience, to be subject, in the first place, to the civil government, and that because "the powers that be are ordained of God." After this the Apostle descends from one state or order to another, till he reaches that of servants, and he sets before them their duty to their masters, and that is, to obey them with all due submission and reverence. And to obey not only those masters who were good and gentle, but also to obey even those who were *froward*, that is, the perverse, the unreasonable and austere. And that, by acting thus, they would show that they considered their obligation to their relative duties not to depend so much on the character or the worthiness of the person to whom they were to be performed, as on the unalterable relations of things as ordained by God. It appears that the poor Christians, and especially those of them who had been converted to Christianity while in a state of slavery, were often grievously abused by their masters, and that not only because they were Christians, but more especially so because they would not join with their masters in any act of idolatrous worship. And no doubt but that under

this cruel treatment from their masters, many of them were ready to sink under the weight of their heavy burdens! And in order to encourage them to endure all this the more patiently, the Apostle reminds them of the cruel treatment, and the unexampled sufferings of their blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, how patient, meek and gentle He was from first to last, that they could not expect to fare better than their Lord, and that "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." And in the text he proceeds to show them the demeanour of our Lord Jesus Christ under His most cruel treatment and unparalleled sufferings, and adds thus, "Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again," &c. Now let us notice—

I. The facts here related concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, "He was reviled, and He endured." It is very sad to think of the terrible state of mind that some people get into when their honour is doubted, their veracity questioned, and when what they call their good names are traduced! Their very countenances seem to be distorted, and their bosoms, like the bodies of some animals which could be mentioned, seem to be swelling and heaving within them; they lose all control over themselves, they get so electrified, as it were, with such *furious* passions, that though when they are in their sober senses they may be considered quiet, sensible people, yet now, when smarting under an insult, they find their words get choked in their throats, they are too many and too big for them to utter them, and they appear for the time being like the poor lunatic of whom we read in the Gospel, "sore vexed, and foaming again!". They are indeed so completely under the influence of angry, vindictive feelings, that they are no longer *men*, but "natural brute beasts," for they are in every sense of the word *mad*, and we have been taught from childhood that "anger is a short madness.* They give vent to their feelings during these paroxysms in the most violent and insane attitudes! The Holy Name of God, and the horrible name of the Devil, things sacred and profane, are jumbled together and thundered forth in the most hideous, blasphemous expressions! Their first impulse is revenge, and if they can succeed to get the unhappy, and it may be the unintentional, aggressor, once into their power, they are cowardly enough to attempt his ruin, to have his blood, and even his very life! Hence we hear of "honour" and "satisfaction" demanded, of cruel wars, of desperate duels, of untimely deaths, costly lawsuits, fines and imprisonments, of establishments broken up, and families scattered abroad, never to be united any more in this life! But what is the grossest insult and the most unmanly attack upon the honour and veracity of the best man when made by another, compared with the insults that were heaped upon our blessed Saviour by the rich and the poor, by the learned and the ignorant? Why, every insult that has ever been offered by one man to another since sin has deluged this fair world of ours with confusion, misery, and blood, from the death of Abel up until now, and accumulate instances as you may, is not worth the name when compared with those which were offered to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ!

You must understand here, that the greater the dignity of the person attacked, the greater also the indignity offered, hence imagination and language here fail us to describe those insults offered to our Saviour, and any examples which we can bring forward are infinitely too inadequate to warrant a comparison! And as He was the greatest and the most glorious Person that ever did and ever will appear in this world, so also He was the greatest sufferer from all manner of calumnies and indignities, that man or devil could invent. And because He was so "meek and lowly in heart," so easy of access to the poorest, the meanest, and the most degrading of characters, because he would condescend to accept an invitation to a dinner or supper, whenever either the curiosity or the kindness of those with whom He came in contact would open the door to Him; and because He, without any Pharisaical reservation, would partake of "whatsoever was set before Him, asking no question;" and because, no doubt, He engrossed the general conversation at the table, and that not with frivolous, common-place observations, as we generally indulge in, but with "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, in the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord"; and again, because He taught "whilst He was yet with them" those profound mysteries which had been hidden in the bosom of the Father from the foundation of the world, and that so affectionately, so simply, but yet with such irresistible effect, that it would cause Mary to forget all her domestic duties and "sit at His feet to hear His words," and at another entertainment, again, to cause "a woman that was a sinner to wash His feet with tears, and to wipe them with the hairs of her head, to kiss them, and anoint them with ointment"—His enemies took advantage of His great condescension and affability to misconstrue His pious intentions, and to cavil at the purity of His motives. And they gradually got so filled with deadly prejudice against Him, that it caused them to invent and to publish the most groundless and fiendish libels upon Him that were ever fabricated by "the forgers of lies," namely, "Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." And again, "He hath a devil." When He who "did no sin," and whose very enemies were compelled to confess of Him, saying, "Never a man spake like this man," had after all to suffer "such contradiction of sinners against Himself," what wonder, then, to hear Him say, "They daily

* Ira furor brevis est.

mistake My words; all that they imagine is to do Me evil." Human nature was never seen in its perfection and glory since the Fall except in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we read of Him that "He did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth." And since He was so "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," He could challenge His most bitter enemies and openly ask them, "Which of you convinceth Me of sin?" What, then, did He do to deserve all the insults and the cruel treatment which He received? Can you mention to me a single instance in the whole history of His life when He ever said or did anything tending in the remotest degree to deserve the calumnies, the slanders and the insults, which were heaped upon Him by the world? I invite you to answer me, if you are able, and bring your charges forward, in order that I, for the first time, may hear them. And if you cannot, then cease for ever from your insults to Him, and be "ye clothed with shame and dishonour."

It was said of old, and that by one who had experienced his share of it, that "Man was born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward"; but that man, notwithstanding all that he suffered, had been at one time "The greatest of all the men of the east," and as he was also a man "that feared God and eschewed evil," we may venture to conclude, that he had not only been a rich, but also a happy man. And he was particularly happy in his latter days, for we read, that "The Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning." But we have never read (at least, I never have), of a man who had to pass through one unbroken scene of poverty, degradation, and consequently, of unhappiness from the cradle to the grave, but our blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ! It is said by some learned men, but I cannot vouch for it, that our Saviour was born in the winter, but I can vouch that though He lived about thirty-three years on this earth, yet He never saw one summer, that is, no riches, no abundance, no! and not even a sufficiency of the common necessaries and conveniences of life, but on the contrary His whole life was one continued dreary winter of poverty and humiliation with Him! The heart feels when we read that "The Prince of the Kings of the earth hungered," and when we hear Him say, "I thirst"! It was His great poverty and want that caused Him to exclaim in these sorrowful words, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the son of man hath not where to lay His head"! Poverty is an evil in itself very hard to bear, but to be twitted with it when a man was born poor, and to twit him again with the poverty of all his friends and relations, as if he could help it, makes the burden still more intolerable to bear! And so we find that when our Lord's enemies beheld His wisdom, and the mighty miracles which He performed, they began reproachfully to ask, 'Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary? and His brethren James and Joses and Simon and Judas? And His sisters, are they not with us? Whence then hath this Man all these things?"

A man of strong sense and of some experience in the world, *may* afford to excuse the uncivil behaviour, and the coarse language of the ignorant rabble, for they know no better. But when the principal men among the people take to revile a man and make a laughing-stock of him, and that when he is innocent, "Their tongue is to him as an arrow shot out" (Jeremiah ix. 8), and every contemptuous, angry look, a piercing sword! And so it was here with our blessed Lord. For in His case, we behold King Herod, descending, as it were, from his gorgeous throne, Annas and Caiaphas, the two high priests, divesting themselves of their costly ephods, and the scribes, or the doctors of the law, who *did*, or *ought* to have known better (John xv. 22), all joining together with the passers by, the common soldiers, and the rabble to wag their heads, and rail at Him! What imagination can conceive, and what tongue of man or angel can express what He suffered? What wonder then to hear Him exclaim, as if on the brink of despair under all this intolerable, consciously undeserved treatment, saying, "Rebuke hath broken My heart, I am full of heaviness; I looked for some to have pity on Me, but there was no man, neither found I any to comfort Me"!

II. His patience and Godlike conduct under His cruel treatment and sufferings, "He reviled not again, and He threatened not."

Notwithstanding the great effect reproaches and insults are known to have on well-educated men and men of refined manners, as I have already stated to you, yet it was quite otherwise with our blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. But we must not doubt from His passive and quiet demeanour, that He did not feel all the indignities heaped upon Him as acutely, nay, indeed, infinitely more so than the most refined and perfect man that ever lived; yet He never once resented the indignities, nor threatened to avenge the unparalleled insults which were offered to Him. We are ready to admit that honour, integrity and good name, are precious jewels, and that the unhappy man who happens to lose them is reduced accordingly in the public estimation. Hence the reason that most men are so anxious to obtain the good opinion of others, and to secure the voice of the public in their favour. Men have got so infatuated with this idea, as to call "the voice of the people, the voice of God." Vox populi, vox Dei. And we have read of men who were brave enough to face the cannon and the sword on the battlefield without shrinking, having forgotten themselves under a slight, a ridicule or contempt. They would prefer to die rather than live under a cloud; life had no longer any attraction for them, all its glory being gone; they also were ready to disappear with it!

You will not find one instance in the whole history of our blessed Saviour's life, when He ever resented an injury, or affront, or threatened to revenge Himself on any one. Shall I here take you back for a moment to the Old Testament history, and remind you of what Elisha did when he was mocked by the naughty little children at Bethel, when he cursed them in the name of the Lord, and when two she-bears came out of the wood close by and "tore to pieces forty and two of them!" And shall I remind you again of what the disciples did when the unkind Samaritans refused to receive our blessed Saviour, and when they said, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?" And what was the answer they received? Why, "Jesus rebuked them," and said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man came not to destroy lives, but to save them." We find that the law of retaliation, Lex Talionis, has existed since the earliest ages of the world, and that it prevailed amongst the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans, and the same spirit continues to prevail, more or less, in many civilized countries to this day. But our Lord Jesus Christ was never actuated by the spirit of revenge; vindictiveness was never harboured within His guileless bosom. Had there been any infirmity or imperfection in Him, judging from one's own personal feelings, and possessing "all power in heaven and in earth," as He did, one would have thought that revenge would have been the sweetest ingredient in His bitter cup. But no, for He knew how to suffer in a manner worthy of Himself, and so we read that "He was oppressed and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth, He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth." And the same striking portraiture of conscious innocence, of meekness, patience, and resignation, is breathed out by the apostle in the words of the text, that is, "When He was reviled, He reviled not again, when He suffered, He threatened not." And here, let me remind you, my brethren, that we "call ourselves Christians," and pretend to be the followers of "the meek and the lowly Jesus," but the great question is, Do we "follow His steps"? When any one reviles us, or speaks disparagingly of us, we too often go about to teach him how to respect us, not by good example of patience and forbearance, but by trying to retaliate upon him, and the greater the harm we can manage to do him, the sweeter our revenge! But this conduct is unworthy of the name we bear as Christians; it betrays us, it takes off the veil from our faces, and exhibits us to the world in our true light and character, and that not as "the children of God, but as the children of the devil," for we read that "whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not the brethren." If any of you wish to have a pattern or a model by which to form your lives, as becomes your high profession, then "Look unto Jesus the author and finisher of your faith," never lose sight of Him, and you cannot go wrong. Though almighty in power and commanding all nature, who could say to the sea when convulsed with the wind, and to the roaring tempest, "Peace, be still"! Who had only to tell the dead, "Come forth," or "Young man (who lay dead on the bier), I say unto thee, Arise," and lo! he at once obeys His command! who struck helpless to the ground, as though they were dead, the stalwart soldiers who went to apprehend Him in the garden, by only saying, "I am He"—yet "when He was reviled, He reviled not again, and when He suffered, He threatened not." I must beg you once more to look at His conduct in the garden of Gethsemane, and there you will see St. Peter "the prince of the apostles," in his great hurry and confusion, taking out his sword and smiting off with it the ear of one of the servants of the high priest. But what did Jesus do? Why, He sharply rebuked Peter, and said unto him, "Put up thy sword into its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels," that is, about 72,000. Oh! Peter, as if He had said, it is "not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit I am going to fight and to conquer." I shall set before mankind such an example of godlike patience and forbearance, that will roll back the curse from this unhappy world, and cause it to bloom again as the garden of the Lord." And He immediately touched the servant's ear and healed him. When reading this piece of history one is inclined to think that this incident, if not ordained, had been allowed to occur in order to check that propensity which is but too strong and apparent in a large number of mankind, namely, to have recourse to physical force, or to Lynch law* on all occasions; and more particularly to restrain private individuals from avenging private injuries, which they should rather leave to the magistrate or to God.

And here, my brethren, I invite you for once to accompany me in your minds to Mount Calvary, and there behold our Saviour hanged on the cursed tree of the cross. And do you see the rulers of the people wagging their heads, and do you hear them deride him, saying, "He saved others, Himself He cannot save"? Under this accumulation of indignities, of insults and reproaches heaped upon the innocent Jesus, we see the sun hiding his face, we feel the earth rending under our feet, and even "the dead, that slept in the dust of the earth," could not lie in their peaceful beds any longer, but they must come forth as living witnesses

* This was a punishment inflicted by private individuals, independently of the legal authorities. It was first of all exercised by a farmer, called John Lynch, upon fugitive slaves and criminals in North Carolina.

of the truth of all that He ever did and ever said. But what does Jesus do Himself? Does He revile them back? Does He threaten to revenge upon them? No! but He *prays* for them, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." And thus He not only wished their pardon, but turned their Advocate and pleaded with His last breath for the vilest of the vile! What a noble example to all His followers, that they also should let ignorance, infirmities and passions, be heard in mitigation of their resentments, and thus become ready themselves to pardon, and to implore the pardon of God, for the very worst of enemies!

One sentence more and I have done, and may that be indelibly engraved on your minds for ever, and that is, "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses."

GOD'S GRACE.

By the Rev. H. L. THOMPSON, M.A.,
Rector of Iron Acton, Bristol, late Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday Evening, Dec. 18th, 1881.

"There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High."—Psalm xlvi. 4.

FROM a living spring within the recesses of the Temple vaults at Jerusalem issued the small brook of Siloam. Its fresh and bright waters filled two, perhaps three, pools, and then flowed on, a tiny but pure stream, shedding fertility and beauty upon the otherwise barren hill slope, to the gardens of the King—the royal Paradise—where olive groves, fig trees, and pomegranates grew, nourished by its gentle current. It was an ever-living brook, and was contrasted on the one hand with the winter torrent, noisy and turbulent in the winter storms, but dried up in the heat of summer; and on the other hand with the mighty river, too strong and wide and vehement to be of service to mankind.

And it was a sacred stream, hallowed by sacred uses, and associated in Holy Scripture with a sacred significance. "The waters of Shiloah which go softly," are spoken of by Isaiah as an emblem of the peace and prosperity which the Holy City enjoyed under the protection of its God. It was to Siloam that the Levite was sent with the golden pitcher upon the last great day of the Feast of Tabernacles; it was from Siloam that he brought the water which was then poured over the sacrifice in memory of the water from the rock of Rephidim; and it was to this Siloam water that our Lord pointed when He stood in the Temple on that day and cried, "If any man thirst let him come unto Me and drink."

Nor was it useful for sacred purposes only. Its pure water provides a constant supply for the daily necessities of the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and as it was a never-failing spring it could be trusted in time of siege: the beleaguered city could depend on it for sustenance. Can we wonder if, for these and other reasons, the stream of Siloam was a famous and grateful stream to the people of Jerusalem? Can we wonder if it is spoken of, as in this psalm, in words of affection and delight. The gentle, undisturbed, refreshing flow of the tiny brook is contrasted with the noise and turbulence and confusion of the waters of the sea. The enemies of the Jews are likened unto the sea, angry and fierce and troubled; they have no rest, no peace; they are blessed with no Divine favour, they have none of the quietness and confidence which is the strength of God's chosen people. But Jerusalem itself, the Holy City, safe under the protection of Jehovah, is likened to the smooth, tranquil, peaceful brook of Siloam; the

> Brook that flowed
> Hard by the oracle of God.

Within the hallowed region rest and happiness shall prevail. God is in the midst. God's help and strength are never-failing, while the world outside is restless, wild, and confused. "The waters rage and swell, the mountains shake;" but, "There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the Tabernacles of the Most High."

Shall we dwell for a little while upon the thoughts which these beautiful words suggest; beautiful in the very music of their sound; beautiful in their first poetic meaning; beautiful in the deep and wide significance which may not improperly be attached to them?

The psalm itself was undoubtedly written as a Hymn of Triumph; and it has been conjectured that it celebrates the marvellous deliverance of the chosen people from the second invasion of the great Assyrian monarch, Sennacherib. Its words are often compared with some portions of the prophecy of Isaiah, who had spoken of the King of Assyria and his host as "the waters of the river, strong and mighty; and he shall come up over all his channels and go over all his banks, and he shall pass through Judah, and shall overflow and go over." Once already, having displayed his power against Babylon and Media, against Phœnicia and Egypt, Sennacherib had invaded Palestine, and had brought Hezekiah into submission. And now for the second time his forces threatened the Holy Land: they had marched on to the frontier of Egypt, and from that position ambassadors had been sent demanding the complete submission of the revolted King of Judah. There seemed but little hope of his being able to withstand the power of the great Monarch, who had conquered once and would conquer again: the mighty torrent could not be stemmed: the raging waters must overwhelm the Holy City. But no; God's arm

put forth its strength. The victor was suddenly vanquished, but not by human valour. Secular history confirms the sacred narrative, that in one night the Assyrian host was all but destroyed. "The angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses."

It was a signal deliverance: a deliverance wrought, as in ancient days, not by man but by the hand of Jehovah. What wonder if the voice of sacred song burst forth, celebrating the Holy City, safe under God's protection, resting calm and peaceful in its ancient beauty, while the troubled sea had raged without. "We will not fear though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea, though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. Come, behold the works of the Lord! what desolations He hath made upon the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth, He breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder: He burneth the chariot in the fire."

And now mark the contrast. "There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High. God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved. God shall help her when the morning dawns." "When they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses."

But pass from this first significance of the words, and consider them as illustrating Divine truth in other and indirect ways. And may we not rightly apply them to the life of the regenerate man, whose living faith in Christ makes him bold and stedfast and strong and happy? Is he not a Temple of the Holy Ghost? Is not the Kingdom of God within him, even the holy place of the Tabernacles of the Most High? Is he not the possessor of that marvellous gift, the indwelling grace of the Holy Spirit? God's grace, His spiritual gift, comes to the believer like the waters of the gentle, pure, refreshing stream. It comes from a secret source, in the hidden places of God's dwelling. Like the waters of Siloam it has a beneficent and a healing power. It flows ceaselessly; its stream is bright and good; it makes the heart of the believer glad, it makes him fruitful unto every good work. Like the hill side, covered with verdure where the sacred brook flowed, but dry and barren where its waters did not penetrate; so is the servant of God, rich under this vivifying influence, bringing forth much fruit, because made fruitful by the grace of God. "There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the Tabernacles of the Most High."

The grace of God, issuing from a secret source, silent, unobserved in its working, but powerful to move and inspire the whole being of the believer: this is the gift which God has promised, this is the gift which Jesus Christ has gained for men. Who does not long to receive it? Who does not long for the gladness, and brightness, and fruitfulness of the life which shall be continually nourished by this hallowing influence? To dwell near to our heavenly Father—to be in Christ, as a living member of His Body—to be guided by the gracious presence of God's Holy Spirit: such a life must surely be a matter of desire, at all events, even by those who believe not much in religious truth. Who does not, in thoughtful moments, or when trouble or bereavement tears the veil from the illusions of life, who does not long for some great force which shall break the bonds of deadening habit, which shall lift him up from selfish aims, and mean and narrow motives, to worthier aspirations and worthier deeds? But the longing, heartfelt though it may be, will seem to many as a longing for what cannot come to pass; if a holier, nobler life be confessedly an object of desire, they say, it cannot be attained by *them*: they have not the power of faith, or the power of love: God is distant from them, His Spirit is not felt within their hearts: with no gladness, with no ennobling purpose, they must toil through the weary struggle of life, they cannot win that inward peace and strength which the full consciousness of God's near presence and generous, gracious help alone can give.

But, my brethren, how often do men fail to notice what is within the range of their eyesight! How often do they fail to catch sounds which are audible to the attentive ear! The child Samuel mistook the voice of God for the voice of Eli. May we not, like him, be spoken to by God, and yet not know His voice? The grace of God, we may be assured, comes to men by secret ways, through hidden, unsuspected channels, but none the less effectually, none the less fruitfully: you will not say, it cannot come to you, because your faith is very weak, or your obedience is no obedience at all: God does not ask for correctness of belief as a necessary condition of His coming near to us in love: the very power to believe, the first rudiments of definite faith are His gift and His alone. God does not ask for strict obedience as a necessary condition of the bestowal of His grace: the very earliest wish to obey His law, the first conflict with your own unruly will, these also are His gifts. Look into your life, with its common, it may be its petty and trivial incidents; is not God's voice unceasingly to be heard? You undergo some trouble, some loss, some disappointment; they are sent by your loving Father, that He may reveal Himself to you by their means. You have the bright happiness of home, with assured affection, and mutual sympathy, and the thousand sweet interests of united family life. God sends you these good things, and would have you love Him for them. His gifts are many and various,

but all are meant to guide us to Him who bestows them. And in this of course lies their danger. He gives us all we possess, but He would not have us forget the Giver: He would not have us blind our eyes or harden our hearts: He desires that we should look up to Him who brings us all the things which make the discipline and the joy of life —He reveals Himself, if only we would behold Him, He speaks, if only we would hear, in all the changeful experience of common days.

And how, in our own conduct, may we best fit ourselves to discern His presence? How may we best, as in the Holy Presence, rule our actions? Surely, in this Advent season, when our thoughts are continually led to dwell on Jesus Christ coming in great humility, we may insist especially on that profound truth which is expressed in the simple words, God "giveth grace unto the humble." Yes; unless this great gift, itself the outcome of the grace of God, be won, there can never be experienced the richer and deeper spiritual life. We must put on humility, in our judgments, in our temper, in our habitual conversation and purpose, and then, and then only, can we gain that self-knowledge without which no true advance can be made in goodness or in usefulness.

"Wouldst thou rule in the kingdom of nature?" says the great English philosopher. "Into that realm, as into the Kingdom of Heaven, none can enter except as little children." They must be ready to learn and not to teach, to question rather than to criticise, to notice and record and group together the facts which nature provides, till the wide and deep generalization, which brings unity out of diversity, simplicity out of confusion, has been established, not by hasty survey, or by hazardous guess work, but by lending the ear humbly to Nature's voice, and catching the truth which she reveals. And we cannot hope to discover spiritual truth unless we seek it humbly, with patient, docile, receptive minds. There are many earnest and pure men to whom the attainment of religious truth, at least in its more definite and accurate forms, seems difficult or even impossible. They cannot bring themselves to accept it. They cannot be satisfied as to the evidence in its favour. They do not feel that it supplies their own spiritual needs. But, my brethren, let them ask themselves quite honestly whether they have brought to the consideration of these momentous matters that temper of humility to which God promises His divine grace? Have they been desirous to be disciples rather than critics? Have they taken pains that no preconceived notion of what God's truth should be, and no exaggerated estimate of their own ability to discover it, shall interfere with the soundness and accuracy of their judgment? Have they asked themselves whether their intellectual calibre, their training and studies, the tone and purpose of their moral life, have fitted them to form a final and independent decision on these weighty matters? Knowledge gives power: but it is that true knowledge which is gained by humility, and ever retains humility as its handmaid. Humble indeed, my brethren, we needs must be, if we turn our thoughts with any seriousness away from ourselves, and contemplate Him who created and ruleth all things, God, the Everlasting, the Unchanging, the All-powerful, the Omnipotent. He of whom Moses sang, "Thou hast been our refuge from generation to generation," He Who remaineth a King for ever, from everlasting to everlasting is the same. Before His sleepless eye pass the countless multitudes of the race of men, His creatures: they come, they vanish: nation after nation builds up its history, leaves its mark upon the destiny of the world, and then decays: new types, richer forms of civilized life, succeed one to another: and each separate man, the tiny unit of the tiny community, is born and lives and dies: he experiences happiness and sorrow, he uses well or ill the gifts of his Maker, he sins and repents, struggling, falling, rising, in the few hours of his transitory life. How small, how feeble, how utterly contemptible must men appear in comparison with God, the Eternal, the Unchanging: who but must humble himself in the dust at the thought of his Creator's majesty and his own nothingness?

But then, to each single unit of that innumerable multitude God has given a separate immortal soul; on each He has placed an individual responsibility; from each He demands a return, with interest, of the talents, few or many, entrusted to him.

You remember perhaps how a famous English humourist has told us that he never could gaze upon a vast crowd of people gathered together in some London street, or within the walls of some great building, without wondering how each separate person of those on whom he looked would die. The thought was morbid and unprofitable—the spectre of mere physical death haunted his imagination. But may it be allowed to the preacher who sees before him this great concourse of immortal human beings, to suggest the solemn question, how will each one of us who are gathered together in this church to-night, how will each one of us endure the final trial in the presence of the "Judge of quick and dead."

> Before whose bar severe
> With holy joy or guilty dread
> We all shall soon appear.

How will each of us give an account of the talents entrusted to him; the talents of intellect, which under the guidance of humility, should lead us to accept God's truth, and take it as the work for life; or the talent of love and kindness, which, under the sweet sustenance of God's grace, may flow like the soft and gentle brook of Siloam, refreshing the barren soil around, bringing gladness and fruitfulness wherever its genial waters may penetrate.

What shall we say then? What shall we do? Happy those who thus in faith can throw themselves

with just confidence upon God's boundless mercy, and in deep humility plead for pardon in that dreadful day for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1881.

WE commend Canon Farrar's noble sermon, the greater portion of which we print on another page, to the attention of such of our readers as were offended at our recent discussion of the moral and physical evils, as well as of some suggested remedies, of the brazen harlotry to which he alludes. As the sermon appeared in the *Guardian* last week, we omit portions of it which advocated the provision of Improved Dwellings and of Healthy Amusements for the poor at the expense of the tax-payers and about the policy of which there will be considerable difference of opinion: because we do not believe that, if provided, they would at all diminish the prostitution which has made the heart of London a foul blot on civilisation, and converted its noblest streets each night into an open mart of infamy and disease. The Canon, we believe, has understated the character and the magnitude of the evil. There is nothing, surely, so filthy, degrading, demoralizing, revolting, and hideous to be found in any other country as the scenes enacted every night in Piccadilly and Regent-street, where crowds of women, girls, and even young children are permitted to offer themselves for hire in public and in the actual presence of the police. The theory is that these women congregate here for lawful purposes and cannot legally be removed. It is utterly false. No doubt the Middlesex Magistrates, by closing one after the other the resorts of these women, have driven all this vileness into the streets, and the police who can clear the thoroughfare in case of fire in two or three minutes, cannot or will not make clean these festering pavements, and so prevent our sons and our daughters too from passing through this hideous danger and temptation, which is a veritable fire to Moloch! Last summer there was an outburst of virtuous indignation at some English girls being decoyed to Belgium. If we are the only nation in the world that permits an open mart for girls to be held each evening in the centre of the Metropolis, what wonder that it should attract those who are on the look-out for the human merchandise, and that the foreign trade should flourish as well as the home trade? We foster the one and yet profess to be scandalized that the other should exist.

VOLUNTARY AGENCIES IN THE CHURCH: THEIR AIM, DEVELOPMENT, AND ORGANIZATION; WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SUNDAY SCHOOL WORK.*

By the Rev. G. E. WATKINS.

Dear Friends,—Having been invited by your Committee to address you on the subject of Voluntary Agencies in the Church, with especial relation to Sunday Schools, you will perhaps allow me, in moving the adoption of the Report, to call your attention to this important subject.

I propose to deal first with the development and organization of lay work, with reference to the necessity for further evangelistic effort to supplement existing agencies; secondly, with the aims of one branch of lay work in particular, in which most of those present are engaged: the religious training of the young, their instruction in the principles of the Church of England, and the importance of their being united, in bonds of union and fellowship, with their elders, in that branch of Christ's Church on earth to which we belong, so that they may be gathered into "one Fold, under one Shepherd." (John x. 16.)

In dealing with the first of these divisions of my subject, viz., The Development of Voluntary Lay Agencies in the Church, the inadequacy of existing machinery to meet the increasing spiritual want and destitution amongst the populations of our growing towns and industrial centres, is a sufficient justification and warrant for insisting on the necessity of further effort, and a plea for the extension of existing organizations in the Church.

In dealing with the second part of the subject, I hope to show the importance of the recognition of Sunday Schools as auxiliaries of the National Church in the work of educating her younger members in the principles of the Christian Faith: enabling her, in some measure, to discharge her responsibilities to the young, and to attach them to herself as the Established Church as the national guardian of true religion in this country, and as a branch of the Church of Christ, founded by the Apostles in accordance with their Divine Master's commission, and inheriting the promise they received at the time of His departure (Luke xxiv. 50; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20), "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." . . . . .

An institution like the Church of England, with limited resources, and those for the most part localised, as far at least as their origin and source, previous to the present century, permitted, cannot hope, without an extension of her means or increased elasticity in their application, to cope with the demands made upon her in consequence of the unforeseen growth of spiritual destitution in centres where the provision made was only intended to meet the wants of the population of say fifty or a hundred years ago. For in many localities, especially in the suburbs of our metropolis and the outskirts of manufacturing towns, the tendency of recent years has been for the growth of the population to outstrip the capacities of local government, as well as to escape from the spiritual oversight of the Church, by reason of its rapidity, the varying conditions affecting the employment of labour, and the migratory habits of many of the labouring classes. This has been the result, amongst other

* An Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Bristol and Clifton Church of England Sunday School Teachers' Association, held at Colston Hall, on Friday, Oct. 21st, 1881.

causes, of the application of mechanical contrivances to the *manufactures* of the country, *manual* labour being superseded in some branches of employment more or less by the adaptation of machinery worked by steam to the various stages and processes of manufacture. Again, the facilities of locomotion have induced a restless disposition in the classes affected by these mechanical developments, and have likewise enabled merchants and other employers of labour to reside away from their places of business. And in consequence of all this, the Church has been unable to keep pace with the time, for being organised mainly on the parochial and diocesan system, her operations have been too much restricted to those localities where sufficient material provision has, in time past, been made for the exercise of her spiritual functions. For the Church of England, considered as an external system, consists of an aggregation of a vast number of parishes, or corporations sole, with boundaries more or less distinctly defined, apportioned according to a somewhat arbitrary system amongst a limited number of dioceses, and having only those bonds of union with other parishes and dioceses, which interests and responsibilities in common are calculated to promote and strengthen. But these privileges and obligations do not always suffice to promote common action between clergy and laity, or even between the several orders of the ministry, in efforts to extend the elasticity of the Church's operations by way of organization, extension, or otherwise, in those directions in which common action would tend to promote the efficiency and scope of her ministrations.

Hence has arisen the necessity of further Evangelistic effort in the Church, in order to overtake in some measure the vast and deplorable arrears, which under existing conditions, and for so long a time past, have been suffered to accumulate.

I am not, however, proposing on the present occasion, to indicate how the Church might best adapt her existing resources in men and means, so as to allow her beneficed or licensed clergy more scope for their efforts, nor how she might utilise the services of many of the thousands of her ministers who belong to neither class, by enlisting them in efforts of an extra-parochial and itinerant character, amongst the busy hives of industry or in the homes of the thickly congregated workers and their families, after their daily labours during the week as well as on the day of rest, where Church workers have not hitherto effectually penetrated, and where in consequence, other agencies and other influences are at work.

My present plea is rather for the recognition either of distinctly lay-agencies, or of the inclusion of trained bodies of laymen, by means of an extension of the diaconate, amongst the recognised orders in the Church, as workers together with the clergy.

And this plea for a special supplementary and systematic Evangelistic effort, has received remarkable encouragement and support from the proceedings of the Congress held the week before last at Newcastle. The question is receiving attention at the present time in several dioceses, your own and those of St. Albans and Newcastle amongst the number, circumstances having, in the Providence of God, contributed to the development of an interest in its solution amongst those—the head pastors of the Church—with whom the responsibility chiefly rests to deal with it, and to give it, when found, practical effect. But many earnest-minded laymen have already arrived at a more or less definite conclusion, both as to the necessity of some action being taken, and as to the nature of the experiment which the present crisis calls for. It seems "to force upon the Church the consideration of the necessity of greater freedom and elasticity of spiritual action, especially in that work of general Evangelism to which Wesley's life and labour were devoted. The consideration is a large and difficult one, yet we feel convinced that it must be faced." (*Guardian* Leader, October 12th.)

There is another general consideration to which I must call your attention before proceeding to deal with the importance of Sunday-Schools as Auxiliaries of the National Church.

It is the necessity of organization accompanying extension, the framing of the requisite machinery to enable the Church to discharge more efficiently her growing responsibilities. An army without organisation becomes a mob, an intricate and unmanageable mass of independent units. It surely needs no demonstration from me, that the greater the body of workers in the Church, without sufficient oversight and control, the greater would be the ultimate confusion. A speaker at the late Congress on this point, in more condensed and striking language, thus expressed the same idea :—"There are times when the fate of an Empire depends upon the valour and intrepidity of her rank and file. There are other times when it depends upon the promptitude and sagacity of those in command. . . . The power of organisation has not been bestowed upon us all. Many a clergyman does his work well, and yet he may be entirely unable to weld together for united action any large body of men and women. We look naturally to our fathers-in-God to come forward and control and guide the restless energies of well-meaning men, and, by wise and loving counsel, direct them into those channels which we believe to be most for the glory of God, and for the permanent good of those affected by them."

(To be continued.)

Reviews and Notices.

"The Pulpit Commentary." Edited by Canon Spence and Rev. J. S. Exell. I. Kings. Kegan, Paul and Co. 1881.

If economy of space had been any object with the publishers of this most voluminous of commentaries, both books of the Kings might, we think, have been sufficiently treated in the present volume. Nor are we sure that the quality of the work might not have been improved by such compression ; for while, on the one hand, we cordially testify to the practical value of the vast stores of material here accumulated for the preacher's use, it still strikes us that the good nature of the editors has allowed not a little to pass, which might have been weeded out without any real loss. Among the first things which a severer censorship might have excised are many of the innumerable portions of verse, which can scarcely be said to adorn the page. Had they been limited to what can in anywise be brought under the definition of poetry, they might be excusable ; but what profit can there be in citing such lines as these :—

> The fairest things below the sky
> Give but a flattering light ;
> We must suspect some danger nigh
> Where we possess delight.

Or these :—

> What guilt, what grief may be incurred
> By one incautious, hasty word.

Again, some of the so-called improvements of texts might well have been suppressed, although we confess that there are fewer of the far-fetched kind than we noticed in previous volumes. But here is a specimen in the homiletics on the two pillars, Jachin and Boaz, in Solomon's temple, which are said to furnish instruction under seven heads to both Jew and Christian. To the Jew they show :—(1.) That the temple was strong, and firm, and lasting. (2.) That its strength and stability were in God. (3.) That it was the shrine of a holy God. (4.) That it was for the worship of a holy people. (5.) That it was for a people zealous of good works. To the Christian they speak :—(1.) Of the Church, the pillar, and ground of the truth. (2.) Of the Christian, who shall be a pillar in the temple of God. With the amplification of these seven heads it may be easily guessed that the imaginative faculty has much more to do than the critical. Once more, space might have been saved, and unity preserved, by not allowing the expositor and the several homilists to contradict one another, as they frequently do. For instance, the expositor maintains that the child restored by Elijah was not dead, but only "in a state of coma," "apparently lifeless;" while the four homilists all assert that this child was absolutely dead, and frame their comments accordingly. The expositor argues that the "ravens" who fed Elijah were either the people of Orbo, or else Arabians; one of the homilists rebukes the critics who resort to such an explanation. The expositor takes the angel, who touched Elijah under the juniper tree, for one of the "ministering spirits," and quotes the beautiful lines about angels from the "Faery Queene"; one of the homilists asserts, "This was no common angel, but one of the Persons of the Godhead."

The introduction gives a sensible but short account of the book, adopting as most probable the Jewish tradition, which ascribes it to Jeremiah, whom it supposes to have compiled the work chiefly from memoirs or chronicles preserved in the schools of the prophets. "The date," it says, "must lie somewhere between B.C. 561 and B.C. 538;" but by a blunder which has defied the vigilance of author, reviser, and editors combined, the argument to establish this is wound up with the assertion that "the work was given to the world between B.C. 460 and B.C. 440, and probably about B.C. 460." A few lines are devoted to the chronological difficulties, which are ascribed to errors of transcription; but neither here, nor in the body of the work, is there any recognition of modern critical problems. Thus the remarkable similarity of style which characterises Solomon's prayer of dedication, the Book of Deuteronomy and the prophecies of Jeremiah, is ignored; so also is the unquestionable fact that the priestly law of altar and sanctuary appears not to have been practically in force till the days of Hezekiah, or even later. Whether Solomon really sacrificed in his own person or not is a question which cannot be satisfactorily disposed of by merely saying that "it is impossible that Solomon could have disregarded that solemn warning (Korah, &c., Numbers xvi. 35) without some protest, or without a syllable of blame on the part of our author."

Among minor points of interest we select a few as specimens of exegesis and treatment. The fact is noticed that in David's last words "there is no mention of a future state—no idea of a future recompense—no hope of a kingdom and a crown;" and it is explained by the statement that "of all this David said nothing, neither in life nor death, because he knew nothing . . . he does not know of a judgment to come . . . to the Jew death was practically the end of life and glory." In drawing a parallel between Judaism and Christianity, in regard to visibility, officers, services, principles of worship, sacraments, precepts, festivals, sacrifice, to support the thesis that "Christianity is built upon the foundations of Judaism," the argument is turned into a warning against forgetting "that the Church is built on the foundation of the Apostles and *Prophets* (Eph. ii. 20);" thus taking it for granted, against all probability, that in that text the *Old Testament* Prophets are intended. The "sin of Jeroboam" is discussed at some length, and is made to consist of heresy, schism, and the sin of Korah; "it was not rebellion, not idolatry, but the worship of the true God in unauthorised places, with unauthorised rites, and by unauthorised ministers." Two lessons are then drawn from it: the infallibility of the Church universal, and the fallibility of private judgment; whence springs the obligation on Christians to submit their faith and practice to the "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* of the Catholic Church." To these we may add that the mention of Josiah's name, in the cry of the man of God against the altar in Bethel, is held to be probably an interpolation from a later marginal note; and that the "lying spirit" commissioned by God to lure Ahab to his ruin is not interpreted of the Evil One, but is taken as a personification of the "spirit of prophecy—the power which, going forth from God and taking possession of a man, makes him a Prophet."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—While reading with very much pleasure the Rev. Courtenay Moore's paper on the "Intermediate State," which he has treated in a truly rational manner, this difficulty arose in my mind:—If the Church teaches and the Bible proves that Christ entered *Heaven*, but that the saved enter *Paradise*, how could St. Paul say that "to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord"?

Christmas Day, 1881. BROADCHURCH.

LOVE OF TRUTH.

SIR,—"Stagnation is death; in movement is life; though running water is not always pure, and Heterodoxy may or may not be bad." Still, nevertheless, there is a well-spring in the moral laws that govern our being. We live in days of unwonted impetus and noxious exhalations, with an occasional herald to usher in a diviner and more marvellous light—a light verified by cosmical causes and forces, and confirmed by the great facts of the universe, and demonstrated by its immutable laws. Sir, I believe in the instinct of expansion, and remain

ANGELINA GUSHINGTON.

P.S.—Some readers may take exception to the statement "that Heterodoxy may or may not be bad." If so, let them know themselves to be such as do not swim in the stream of mighty changes, and remember that "Nero is an angler in the lake of darkness."

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 032513837